

The organic unity of the Pentateuch; a ne

222.1066 T364o

116670



Thomas, John,

Life Pacific College Alumni Library

REV. JOHN THOMAS, M.A.

DATE DUE

222.1066

T364o

Thomas, John

The organic unity of the Pentateuch



LIFE Pacific College
Alumni Library
1100 West Covina Blvd.



THE ORGANIC UNITY OF
THE PENTATEUCH

THE ORGANIC UNITY OF THE PENTATEUCH

A NEW CRITICISM

BY THE

REV. JOHN THOMAS, M.A.

LONDON BIBLE COLLEGE

London

JAMES NISBET & CO., LIMITED

21 BERNERS STREET

1904

Printed by BALLANTYNE, HANSON & Co.
At the Ballantyne Press

640
L.I.F.E. College Library
1100 Glendale Blvd.
Los Angeles, Calif. 90026

DEDICATED TO
A FRIEND AND CO-WORKER
A LOVER OF THE TRUTH

026269

P R E F A C E

THE object of this volume is not the maintenance of tradition, but the pursuit and demonstration of truth. The writer appeals to the reader from a strictly critical standpoint, and claims the attention of all who believe in sincere scientific method as an instrument to be frankly employed in the quest of accurate knowledge. He is aware of the massed prejudices which have to be overcome in re-opening a question which eminent critics have authoritatively closed, and especially in daring to find conclusions at variance with the official theory of the great conclave of the Higher Critics. It is most unfortunate for the cause of truth that the intolerant dogmatism which the Higher Critics have censured so soundly in the advocates of traditionary belief is now being exhibited by themselves with accentuated strength. A certain number of speculative conclusions have been exalted to the status of infallible articles of critical belief, and whoever declines to assent to these is summarily excluded from the elect circle of orthodox critics and treated as being of no account in the province of criticism.

This haughty despotism, armed with the prestige of names eminent in scholarship, has exercised a wide intimidation over critical thought, and held over free and independent criticism an influence not less repressive in its way than that of the thumbscrew and the rack. There are always many who follow the line of least resistance. These have succumbed. A still greater number have been cowed into timid and hesitating silence. This volume dares to deny, and to deny emphatically, that the criticism of the Pentateuch is closed. The writer, in the name of free and independent criticism, requests an unprejudiced hearing for the critical demonstration he has to offer. He asks no favour, and is well content to abide by the judgment of sanity and truth.

THE AUTHOR.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND SOME FUNDAMENTAL POS- TULATES	I
II. THE PROBLEM FOCUSSED	29
III. ORGANIC UNITY	41
IV. JAHVIST AND ELOHIST	52
V. THE EVIDENCE OF THE "DOCUMENTS" REGARDING THE "SINGLE NAME"	71
VI. THE LITERARY STYLE OF JE AND P	100
VII. THE ARGUMENT FROM DISCREPANCIES	120
VIII. THE INTER-DEPENDENCE OF J, E, AND P	144
IX. THE PLAN OF THE PENTATEUCH	171
X. UNITY OF IDEAS	195
XI. A GENERAL SURVEY	206
XII. CONCLUSION	217

THE ORGANIC UNITY OF THE PENTATEUCH

I

THE PROBLEM AND SOME FUNDAMENTAL POSTULATES

I AM fully, even intensely, aware that I am, in the present discussion, about to oppose my judgment to the flowing tide of those processes and conclusions which are summed up under the title of the Higher Criticism. I am quite alive to the fact that I propose to challenge and controvert conclusions which have not only been widely accepted by both rationalistic and christian scholars, but are even declared by them to have been demonstrated beyond legitimate doubt or question. I dare reject conclusions which have been dogmatically pronounced as final; I venture to reopen questions which august authorities have imperiously closed. Under these circumstances, I know that it will not be easy to obtain a full and unprejudiced hearing for the case which I have to present, for the minds of men are easily

enthralled by the sound of authority and by the "consensus" or vogue of the hour. Yet I cannot forbear, for I am urged to write by a strong conviction of truth; and I remember, to my comfort, that truth has generally had to be maintained by a resolute minority against the apparently overwhelming current of the times. Those who have been carried away by the plausibilities of the Higher Criticism will censure me as one who fights a hopeless battle and maintains an untenable position. I reflect that many who have been similarly censured have won at last; and I am convinced that I have the truth. I fear no censure, and I refuse to surrender my independency of investigation and judgment to a "consensus" of scholars or to any other authority. The last word has not been said while there are arguments yet to be weighed, and such arguments it is my intention to marshal for the consideration of those who have retained the power of pursuing this question with an open mind.

My present concern is with what I shall call throughout this volume the Compilation Theory of the Pentateuch. This is the theory that the Pentateuch (or, including the book of Joshua, the Hexateuch) is a discrepant patchwork of independent documents loosely slung together by successive "Compilers." The attempt has been made to dignify this hypothesis by conferring upon it the title of the "Evolutionary Theory." But, as this title does not accurately suggest the nature of the

hypothesis, and as it is highly desirable that no misleading terms should be used in criticism, I must definitely reject the title, and use the term which most simply and correctly expresses the character of the prevailing critical theory of the Pentateuch. The term, the "Compilation Theory," is both simple and exact.

This theory I am critically unable to accept, as the features which I discover in the Pentateuch are strongly at variance with it, and clearly evidence to my mind the organic unity of this ancient writing. I shall have no difficulty in showing that the conception of "organic unity" is directly opposed to that of "compilation." It is true that Dr. Driver, compelled by certain remarkable features of the book of Genesis, takes refuge in these words: "The unity of plan thus established for the book of Genesis, and traceable in many other details, has long been recognised by critics. It is not, however, incompatible with the use by the compiler of pre-existing materials in the composition of his work." But these words betray much confusion in Dr. Driver's mind between the two very distinct processes of compilation and composition. In fact, he employs both terms as if they were synonymous. The vital question is, not whether use was made of pre-existing materials, but whether the final product was the *composition* of a single designing and unifying mind, or a *compilation* strung together by a collector of heterogeneous documents. The former,

and the former only, could give us organic unity. The product of the latter would prove but a discrepant miscellaneity. It is, in fact, upon the supposed presence of such discrepancy, inconsistency, and heterogeneity in the Pentateuch that the Compilation Theory is built up. Dr. Driver's affirmation, therefore, is inconsistent with the general demands of his theory; for a theory which is mainly based upon discrepancies and contradictions can scarcely account for subtle unities of plan. The greatness of this difficulty for the Higher Critics will become increasingly apparent as we follow them through the confusions which they profess to discover in the Pentateuch.

In the present condition of the Pentateuchal problem, it will conduce to clearness of conception if I present at this point a full preliminary statement of my position and purpose in the present volume. It is claimed by the Higher Critics that the theory that the Pentateuch is a collection of unconnected documents variously joined together by successive compilers is now a settled conclusion concerning which there can be no further intelligent question. Speaking broadly, and in reference to the book of Genesis only, it is claimed as proven that there are three main documents, labelled P and J and E respectively, separated in the process of their composition by considerable intervals of time or space or both, and afterwards somewhat laxly and uncritically strung together by successive hands. It must

be noted that these three documents do not exhaust the requirements of the Higher Critic even in Genesis, while the documents he is obliged to create in Exodus are indefinitely numerous. But, as the documents P and J and E form the groundwork upon which the Compilation Theory is built up, it will simplify our investigation if we concentrate our attention mainly upon these. Dr. Driver (to whose writings I shall frequently allude, since he is regarded as a principal authority among the "moderate" critics) appears to have had many laborious sittings before he succeeded in effecting the disjunction of the JE section into J and E. But patience and ingenuity can remove mountains. At length the dissecting knife triumphed, and the quivering members fell reluctantly apart. The following is Dr. Driver's own statement: "The writer, while readily admitting the liability to error which, from the literary character of the narrative, accompanies the assignment of particular verses to J or E, must own that he has always risen from the study of JE with the conviction that it *is composite*." The italics are Dr. Driver's own, and are sufficiently suggestive. The methods by which he succeeded in effecting the severance of J and E will appear later.

I fully recognise the great abilities and scholarly qualifications of Dr. Driver and of the authorities whom he so faithfully follows. It goes without saying that I make no claim to rival him in the knowledge of the Hebrew tongue; but that does not

exempt him from such criticism of his statements and positions as I am capable of offering within the range of my own knowledge and investigation. What Dr. Driver, or any other man, *knows*, is not the question in the present matter; I have to do solely with what he *affirms*. And it would be intolerable to have the open door of discussion closed to the many thinkers in the country by the authority of a few select names or by any special reputation for expert knowledge. Statements must be tested without respect of persons. Divorced from personality, they must be tried by the impersonal arbitrament of truth and fact. I hope and believe that Dr. Driver would be one of the last men to desire that his reputation and position should be employed to shield his affirmations from the onset of opposing criticism.

Now, it so happens that, in the progress of my critical investigation of these supposed documents, my conclusions have been forced in a direction diametrically opposite to that taken by Dr. Driver. Arguing from the confident tone adopted by the Higher Criticism, and impressed by the carefully compiled citations exhibiting a striking contrast of style and phraseology between the P and JE sections, I entered upon a closer scrutiny of the Pentateuch with my mind more than half persuaded that the *data* from which the Higher Criticism deduced its startling conclusions would emerge beyond doubt or denial. Most certainly did I expect that P and

JE, at least, would completely fall apart from one another. To my surprise, I found that the claim of the Higher Criticism to be precise and scientific was far from being realised in its operations, that its bases were hastily assumed and arbitrary, its methods lax, inaccurate, and highly conjectural. I discovered that experts in Hebrew could, under the pressure of a theory, inaccurately translate and interpret the Hebrew original, and that important considerations, when not convenient, were persistently ignored. Stimulated by these discoveries, I pursued my investigation with more careful method and more rigid precision, subjecting loosely manufactured discrepancies and contradictions to systematic and minute scrutiny. Steadily the discrepancies vanished, and the unities grew. The first point attained was the firm conclusion that J and E had been sundered by defective criticism, and that a more careful and complete employment of critical method maintained their unity inviolate. By the application of the same exact method, the section P also began to resent its isolation, and to claim organic unity with the other portion. Finally, the whole Pentateuch breathed one life through all its members, the organic product of one unifying mind. The critical process by which this result has been reached I now desire to state for the consideration of those who still believe that the Compilation Theory is not the *ne plus ultra* of Pentateuchal exposition, and that the organic unity of the Pentateuch may

still be maintained by a reasonably intelligent mind.

I am aware that the attitude of the Higher Critic towards such a position as mine is one of opposition amounting almost to intimidation. We are relegated to the same dunce's stool as those that deny a plain mathematical axiom. We are informed that all critics "of consideration" have endorsed this doctrine of discrepant documents. The flippant magazine "Reviewer" dismisses our contention as a superannuated singularity, and every newspaper scribbler jeers at our laggard feet. Dr. Driver discharges upon our rebellious heads such a dictum as this: "It cannot be doubted that the same conclusions, upon any neutral field of investigation, would have been accepted without hesitation by all conversant with the subject." *Eheu! me miserum!* What an indictment is this! In the same vein Dr. Driver says again: "The main conclusions of critics with reference to the authorship of the books of the Old Testament rest upon reasonings the cogency of which cannot be denied without denying the ordinary principles by which history is judged and evidence estimated." Other authorities have written in a similar strain.

In the name of a just and liberal criticism, I utter my strongest protest against the attempt to close this discussion by dogmatic pronouncements. To insinuate that your opponent lacks either intelligence or honesty is not argument. As long as

capable and earnest thinkers form variant conclusions, such arrogant *dicta* are inadmissible. I believe that utterances of this kind have intimidated many into bewildered acquiescence, for the scorn of up-to-date wisdom is hard to bear, and its smile is pleasant. A not very flattering parallel to this attempt to close a great question is cited by Bishop Butler in the advertisement to his "Analogy." He says—

"It is come, I know not how, to be taken for granted by many persons that christianity is not so much as a subject for inquiry; but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious. And, accordingly, they treat it as if, in the present age, this were an agreed point among all people of discernment, and nothing remained but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule."

Yet Bishop Butler, the greatest thinker of his day, dissented from the conclusions which were vaunted as obvious and final; and those "people of discernment" look very foolish to-day in the perspective of time. It is not the part of the critic to close the book with summary authority. There are other thinkers and other days; and the judgment shall be by fire.

I am also bound to deprecate most strongly the growing practice of seeking to force the issue by the authority of numbers. In many different forms of phrase we are being constantly and aggressively informed that all "critics of any consideration," and

all Hebrew scholars worth mentioning, have accepted the Compilation Theory of the Pentateuch. Who, then, are we that we should dare to gainsay the verdict of this illustrious company? When men try to press intellectual conclusions by the dead-weight of majority, there is room to suspect that they are at least dimly conscious of some inherent weakness in their case. The enlightened exponents of assured truth have not usually appealed to the verdict of the majority, for this reason among others, that the majority has generally decided against them. The judgments of men must stand for what they are worth in the open place of trial, without reference to numbers either great or small.

There is even observable a tendency, when the Higher Critics complacently vaunt their serried phalanx of scholars, to move in a circle of an exceptionally vicious kind. Those who deny such an "obvious deduction" as the Compilation Theory are, of course, immediately judged to be critics "of no consideration," and it easily follows that "all critics of any consideration" are agreed on that theory. The facile manner in which vital facts and considerations are ignored in such a summary is astonishing. It would be a salutary exercise of mind to recollect now and again that this critical consensus—in so far as it really exists—is a mushroom growth, a raw product of yesterday. In the face of the majestic evolution of far-striding centuries, the pæan of victory sung on its behalf is nothing short of

ludicrous. It is only yesterday, as the progress of thought is reckoned, that such thinkers as Hengstenberg, Havernick, Drechsler, Ranke, Welte, and Keil were in the field of Pentateuchal investigation. To exclude their names in the discussion of to-day involves the violation of the most elementary laws of thought-perspective. It would be impossible to interchange sanities of thought with any man who refused to rank them with "critics of consideration." They were strong in Hebrew scholarship, strong in thought, strong in critical discernment; and the modern Compilation Theory, with the *data* which are supposed to establish it, was specifically before them for acceptance or rejection. They were not the men to reject mathematical certainties, yet they distinctly and definitely rejected the Compilation Theory, and declared for the organic unity of the Pentateuch. The significance of this fact has still the dew of its youth, and may yet prove the strongest condemnation of the present degenerate vogue in which all independency of critical thought has disappeared, and all who would be regarded as "critics of any consideration" laboriously follow in the footprints of Kuenen and Wellhausen. These acknowledged leaders are pronounced rationalists, and the vogue which they have created bears their image and likeness. But the student of history is quite familiar with the phenomenon of transient, yet clamorously self-confident, vogues of rationalistic doubt. Gladstone says concerning the spiritual declension of the

Hanoverian period: "The negative movement of the period may have been quite as vigorous, as widespread, and as self-confident, as that of which we now feel the pressure. Yet it dwindled, and almost disappeared."

Apart from the known tendency of human thought to fall back now and again in a rationalistic ebb, it is not difficult to discern some of the immediate causes which have imposed the vogue of the Compilation Theory upon the "scholars" of to-day; or rather, I should say, upon the "professional scholars," a qualification which represents an important distinction and indicates a significant fact. The average "professional" scholar loves every investigation of the hair-splitting species. The novelty of dissecting an ancient Oriental volume into ingeniously detected microscopic particles, with a new dissecting knife operating on an original scheme, is as sweet to his mind as the song of the sirens was to the heart of Ulysses. Further, the analytical details shot forth in labyrinthine disorder by Wellhausen and others have bewildered the greater number even of the "professionals," so that they have become hopelessly entangled in their own maze. Beyond this, I readily admit that the theory possesses *prima facie* plausibility, especially as between the sections P and JE, and many who are trapped by first appearances never recover themselves from the snare. Probably also some reluctantly acquiesce, though not without many a misgiving, yielding to their

inability to formulate a counter-theory which shall satisfactorily explain the phenomena of the Pentateuch. But in all such cases as the present vogue, there is a considerable proportion who do not really think for themselves, but render their homage to those to whom the honours of the moment seem to belong.

But there are many earnest scholars in this country, while not professional scholars, and not labelled as "scholars" at all, who are maintaining their independency of judgment and investigation. And their verdict has yet to be given. Some men of real strength have already written in a sense adverse to the consensus of the Higher Critics. The latter affect to ignore them, as though they were for some occult reason unworthy of notice; but they will have a hearing by-and-by. Besides these, there is a great body of thoughtful people in the christian church whose spiritual intuitions (not a despicable faculty) repel the naturalistic view of the Old Testament, and the modern theory of the Pentateuch which is imbued with that view. They are not able as yet to confute the theory formally by a "critical" demonstration of the unity of the Pentateuch. But they have the profoundest conviction that the rationalistic theory is false, and that it will be overthrown in God's good time. So it is far too soon yet to reckon the forces on either side, even if it were worth while to do so. "To the law and to the testimony." The matter must still

stand where Gladstone placed it in these wise words—

“Of one thing we may be assured: such a movement derives no real strength, no true promise of permanence, from an overweening self-assertion. The question is not what negation thinks of itself and of the opposing forces, but what is the intrinsic strength of the reasoning on which it rests.”

The gravity of the issues in this controversy imperatively demands the exercise of unqualified intellectual sincerity. Truth requires that we should frankly acknowledge the clear consequences of any principles or theories we have professed to accept. If the end be manifestly false, the knowledge of it may give us pause. If we dexterously disguise the issues, we may lead many astray by guile, and discover our own error all too late. I cannot but believe that such influence as the Higher Criticism has obtained over the minds of christian people is largely due to, or has been largely aided by, the intellectual insincerity of those exponents of it who have not abjured the christian faith. This intellectual insincerity has temporarily succeeded in disguising the vital character of the principles that are at stake, and has lulled sincere christian people into a false sense of security.

I am far from charging men like Dr. Driver, or even writers of meaner calibre, with *moral* insincerity. I could not think such a judgment even of Dr. Cheyne, although the nature of his inner con-

sciousness is more impenetrable to me than that of the Sphinx. I believe that such men as these are morally sincere, and have suffered no sense of moral violence in taking their consciences along with them in the path which they have trodden. But not a whit the less are they, in my judgment, concealing from themselves and others, by an unconscious *intellectual* insincerity, the vital complexion and tremendous consequence of the principles involved. A passage in the *Edinburgh Review* for October 1892 is so clearly illustrative of this attitude of intellectual insincerity, that I take the liberty of re quoting it from the Bishop of Colchester's little book on "The Old Testament and the New Criticism." The writer to the *Review* says that all will be well "if christian teachers will only begin at the central point and pivot of all sacred history; will firmly and boldly take their stand on the appearance of Christ in the world; and from that point will look backwards through all the deepening mist and haze of the old world's religious history, instead of hopelessly trying to begin with Adam and Eve at 4004 B.C., and so work their stumbling way forwards towards Christ. Viewed from that centre, everything falls into its true and natural place. The Hagiography is then seen at A.D. 1, in the air, and in actual process of being precipitated for Synagogue reading. . . . Then behind that cloudy stratum appears, already formed and canonised, the prophetic collection of narratives and orations, shading off (*as all*

literatures do) from prose into poetry, and from the plain naturalism of the Chaldean siege in 2 Kings back to the misty stories of Elijah and the ravens, Samson and Delilah, and Joshua commanding the sun and moon to stand still. Then behind that stratum again appears the primeval system of legislation, codified under Moses' name and breathing his spirit; but shading off, like the rest, into the mysterious past, and illustrating itself by the free use of history, myth, and legend; till, far beyond all ken of clear intelligence, loom large the pan-Semitic traditions about a universal deluge and the Tower of Babel and the giants and the golden age in Paradise and the Divine creation of the world."

This quotation is the fairest possible illustration of the position assumed by certain reverend professors, and by certain other christian ministers, who have regarded it as their special mission to propagate the "findings" of the Higher Criticism. It would scarcely be possible to excel the adroitness and dexterity with which their case is presented in the above excerpt. And, in truth, a more recent statement would be less favourable to them, for the Higher Critics have "advanced" considerably since the *Edinburgh Review* article of 1892. For instance, the divorce between Moses and the Laws of the Pentateuch is now critically so complete that by no stretch of inference can they be critically affirmed to "breathe his spirit." But I will allow even this

uncritical refuge to stand for the moment, and take the adroit apology as it was written in 1892. It must be borne in mind that this Higher Criticism with which we have to deal claims to be absolutely untrammelled by tradition, or by anything save the bare axioms of criticism. It is on this principle that its destructive operations on the Old Testament have been conducted. It challenges us with a demand for perfect freedom for its own pure laws. We accept the challenge and grant the demand. But we must do more, and insist that this principle of absolute freedom shall be adhered to *on all occasions* with unqualified intellectual sincerity. The matter is too important for slipshod generalities or uncritical evasion. In the vital interests of truth, we demand that the Higher Critic shall *never deviate* from the inflexible principles of rigid criticism. If in any case he is found guilty of seeking to safeguard himself by falling back upon faith or tradition, in that act he is convicted of stultifying the critical position and of giving his case away. No man of critical discernment can deny that this is fair and just. The critics have appealed to the inviolate rights of purely critical principles. So be it. By that appeal they must stand or fall.

Thus accepting and insisting upon intellectual sincerity in the exhaustive application of critical principles, we turn to the *Edinburgh Review* apology, which is, as I have said, thoroughly typical. What do we find there? The pivot on which this

"critical" apology turns is found in these words "If christian teachers will only begin at the central point and pivot of all sacred history; will firmly and boldly take their stand on the appearance of Christ in the world." That is high-sounding and even plausible until you begin to realise that the critic has entirely forgotten the critical principles to which he should have honestly adhered, and has betaken himself to an uncritical refuge in order to escape from his critical difficulties. How does he know that Christ is the central point and pivot of *all* sacred history? Has he demonstrated this as a certain critical conclusion by the application of pure and unadulterated critical principles? And what does he mean by bidding us "*firmly and boldly* take our stand on the appearance of Christ in the world"? By any serviceable interpretation of the passage, he must mean that we should take our stand on the historical Christ as the Son of God, the Divine centre of all religion and all history. But on what grounds can we *firmly and boldly* take our stand on this sublime faith? Has it been conclusively and finally deduced by purely critical processes? Or, if not, are we still to maintain our firm and bold stand when criticism affirms that it is no longer tenable? Is Wellhausen to count for everything when he strips Moses bare, and Schmiedel to count for nothing when he subjects Jesus to the same process of critical elimination? If we ignore the conclusions of criticism in the last refuge of faith, why not in the first?

SOME FUNDAMENTAL POSTULATES 19

As a matter of fact, the apology is hopelessly uncritical, and when the Higher Critics offer us a defence in which they confusedly mingle traditionary faith with modern criticism, their weakness becomes painfully apparent. The pure critical principle will not allow us to take our stand "firmly and boldly on the appearance of Christ," any more than upon that of Abraham. An honest adherence to the laws of criticism negates the presupposing of anything. Jesus Christ, no less than Abraham and Moses, must pass through its crucible, and issue forth as one of its conclusions. We press our demand for critical sincerity, and find the above apology critically insincere, and therefore critically worthless. If the naturalistic interpretation of the Old Testament be finally conceded, it is vain to try to believe that Jesus Christ can be shielded from the onset of a jubilant Naturalism which will have already victoriously swept away all besides.

Another typical instance of such evasive intellectual insincerity in the affirmations of the Higher Critics is found in the following statement by Dr. Driver: "Criticism in the hands of christian scholars does not banish or destroy the inspiration of the Old Testament: it presupposes it." There are two points in that brief sentence which (the one by implication, and the other by definite affirmation) distinctly violate the charter of untrammelled freedom claimed for critical processes, the charter without which the conclusions of criticism are of no con-

sequence whatever. The first point is insinuated in the adjective "Christian." What has "christian" or "non-christian" to do with the impersonal laws of criticism? These are universal in their nature, and are quite independent of the religious traditions in which the critic has been trained. If there are rigid and valid laws of criticism, the "christian" critic must observe them to the full no less than the sceptic, and the conclusions of both must be judged alike by the universal laws of reasoning. The suggestion that the adjective "christian" modifies in some undefined way the processes or the conclusions of criticism contradicts the free spirit of criticism, and is intellectually insincere.

The other point for remark is contained in the statement that the Higher Criticism *presupposes inspiration*. Had Dr. Driver, in writing these words, forgotten the elementary principle of true criticism? For its cardinal claim, by which it is fundamentally distinguished from the unreasoning credulity of traditionary belief, is precisely this, that it presupposes nothing, takes nothing for granted. Is the presupposition of the Divine inspiration of the Old Testament such a small matter? Surely not. It is a presupposition of the greatest magnitude and importance. Having gone so far, why not presuppose a thousand other things? If the inspiration of the Pentateuch can be *presupposed*, why not its genuineness and authenticity? If presupposition and criticism can be mingled according

to the inclination of the critic, it will be impossible to determine the boundary where the one may end and the other begin. A thorough-going criticism knows nothing of presupposition. No forecast can be given of the final result of its investigations; and to label this unknown quantity with the anticipatory title of "inspiration" is another signal example of intellectual insincerity.

The sincere and honest application of critical processes requires that we should frankly, fearlessly, and without evasion, recognise the fateful alternatives which are set before us. The serious fact has to be faced that the "christian" critics who have enrolled themselves with the "critics of consideration" have not merely accepted the abstract authority of Criticism, but also the concrete and definite deduction of the Compilation Theory, with its very important implications. They even challenge the intelligence of those who continue to question it. But we can pass that by, and come to the clear and definite issue. The essence of the question to be determined is, whether the religious history of Israel is to be explained on the same naturalistic lines as the history of pagan religions, or on distinctive lines of supernaturalism; and whether the sacred Scriptures of Israel were communicated by supernatural revelation, or are to be explained on naturalistic hypotheses, in close analogy with the mythical and legendary literatures of other ancient nations. There are even graver features than these

in connection with the Compilation Theory, for Wellhausen does not hesitate to apply the label of "pious fraud" to the Pentateuch, and not all the anxious and laboured ingenuities of scared "christian" critics have availed to remove the label, or erase the dishonouring blot from the escutcheon. But we will for the present eliminate this peculiarly disquieting element, and consider the alternatives which would still remain, even if "pious fraud" were not an indispensable factor in the Compilation Theory. As far as I am concerned, I am prepared to abide by the sincere and unwavering principles of criticism, and to accept what is conclusively and unquestionably proved to be the truth, even though it be the barren conception of Naturalism which tenants the Compilation Theory of the Pentateuch. I am ready to tear error and superstition out of my life, even "though my heart be at the root." But, if I accept a theory of Naturalism for what I have been accustomed to call the word of God, I cannot join in the intellectual insincerity which insists that the change is not fundamental. The light-heartedness with which many have accepted naturalistic principles and deductions, and have hastened to join in the task of manufacturing discrepancies in the Bible, is almost heart-rending. If the real issues were not disguised by evasion, such careless flippancy, which is as antagonistic to exact criticism as it is disrespectful to the sacred Scriptures, would scarcely have prevailed to such an extent as it has done.

Mention may be made of curious after-thoughts of christian critics, by which the real alternatives for our choice are disguised. It is argued that the former difficulties created by a few discrepancies in the Old Testament are now *swept away* by the conclusion that the Pentateuch is nothing but a compilation of discrepant narratives! Though this argument has been seriously put forward, comment upon it is unnecessary. It is also contended that the "moral" difficulties which certain men have found in the Old Testament are now satisfactorily removed by the discovery that the Pentateuch is legendary and untrustworthy! This argument has been advanced by "critics of consideration," but it does not require comment any more than the other. It has been further maintained that belief in the Old Testament as Divine revelation hinders men from understanding the spirit of the New Testament. This is a very melancholy discovery to make after some two thousand years of christian history. I do not want to make any assumptions that can be intelligently disputed, so I will not insist upon any particular view of the Saviour's attitude towards the Old Testament; but certainly, if He had wished us to believe that He held the Jewish Scriptures to be a supernatural revelation from God, He could not have spoken otherwise than He did. The apostles, after Pentecost as well as previously, most certainly believed that the Old Testament was a supernatural revelation from God. Were they deficient, as com-

pared with modern scholars, in the apprehension of the spirit of the Christ whom they served and loved ? I trow not.

But the cardinal evasion, the main shelter of the "christian" critic from his own "deductions," has been discovered in the assertion that "the authority for our faith does not rest on the contents of a book, but on the living Christ." This declaration, of course, covers the New Testament as well as the Old, and in its application to the historical Christ could be easily shown to be self-stultifying—a show of words without meaning. But it is with the Pentateuch that I am now concerned, and in this reference the apology completely evades the vital issue. The definition of the *ultimate* authority in religion is not the question that the criticism of the Pentateuch sets immediately and urgently before us. The ultimate authority is obviously the living and eternal God. But the introduction of this ultimate problem in religion is quite beside the mark in the present discussion. The immediate question for us is: In what manner has God revealed and exercised that authority in relation to men ? Has He done so by a supernatural revelation of His will to patriarchs and prophets, a process historically crowned by the supernatural appearance of the Son of God in the flesh ? Or has He done so only in a purely naturalistic way through the subjective gropings of the human mind and spirit in all lands and all ages ? Is the supernaturalism of the Old Testament

a false representation of the ways of God, or is its history of God's supernatural appearances to the old world a true statement of an actual historical preparation for the supernatural coming of Christ? The Compilation Theory decides that both the record and the representation are false, consisting of myths and legends that must be naturalistically explained, in accordance with the analogy of other ancient literatures and religions. I cannot understand how any one can fail to see that the issues involved are of tremendous character and consequence. That each alternative will finally carry with it judgment after its own kind (the one a naturalistic, the other a supernaturalistic, judgment) upon the person of the Christ Himself, I cannot for a moment doubt.

When we raise the matter in hand from the narrower limits of special pleading and private apology to the broad judgment of the centuries, the earnest thinker cannot fail to have regard to the fact that the distinction between the naturalistic and the supernaturalistic principle in the interpretation of the Biblical records has always been held to be the dividing line between belief and unbelief. The votaries of unbelief are at the present time openly and confidently claiming that the naturalism of the Higher Criticism marks the triumph of their cause; and in the ground upon which they base this claim they are supported by the unanimous verdict of the christian centuries. I do not adduce this fact in order to stifle criticism or to hamper its pro-

cesses. We are bound to accept what is proved to be true, no matter what the consequences may be. But a clear sense of the gravity of the situation may imbue our critical researches with a profounder consciousness of responsibility, and save us from heedless manipulations and speculations, a double critical offence of which, as will shortly appear, the Higher Criticism cannot be acquitted.

It has been necessary to emphasise and fix the important fact that a true and exact criticism cannot "presuppose" the inspiration of any portion of the Bible or the divinity of Christ. This must be distinctly kept in view, else the pure principle of criticism soon becomes contaminated and confused by the alien influences of tradition and faith. I must now with no less emphasis point out that Criticism cannot be allowed to presuppose that the world and history are governed by what I have called naturalistic principles. I shall employ the term "Naturalism" throughout this discussion to denote that conception of the world which denies the intervention of supernatural manifestations and forces in human life. The word explains itself with sufficient clearness, and seems more appropriate than the usual word "Rationalism" to describe the attitude both of the confessed sceptic, and of those who believe in a spiritual relation of man to God, but not in any supernatural revelation of God to man. To presuppose the doctrine of Naturalism is as great an offence against pure criticism as to presuppose

the doctrines of tradition, and the former as well as the latter must be rigidly disallowed. The importance of this obvious principle is soon seen when the "demonstrations" of the Higher Critics are submitted to examination.

With one other simple critical postulate I close this introductory chapter. We must insist, constantly and inexorably, that any proposed theory of the composition of the Pentateuch shall be in harmony with the actual Pentateuch, *as it stands written*, and not with a Pentateuch reconstructed by the critics to suit their theory. To this simple condition of true scientific procedure no one will demur except the man who prefers his theories to the truth. The veriest tyro in science knows that to manipulate the facts to fit the theory is to march blindfold into error. Even the *single* exception that contradicts the theory must not be ignored or whittled away; on the contrary, the theory must collapse before its opposition, and another theory must be found in which it can be completely included. It is not necessary for me at this point to express any judgment as to whether the Higher Critics have observed this elementary law of scientific procedure; the facts will reveal themselves in good time. But every man who desires to ascertain the truth will agree with me in insisting that there shall be no manipulation of the actual contents of the Pentateuch merely to satisfy the requirements of a theory. The theory must be judged by the

actual contents and features of this ancient writing, and reconstructions can be allowed only when they are demanded by potent considerations which are independent of any theory. By this law I shall abide; and every man of scientific perception and training will commend it as just.

II

THE PROBLEM FOCUSSED

IN order to apply the principles of criticism surely and effectively, it is necessary to select some well-defined position of vital import as regards the theory we propose to controvert, and to subject that position to a searching and systematic examination. If we can capture the key of the citadel, the rest is only a matter of leisured detail. The writings of the Higher Critics, taking Wellhausen, Kuenen, and Dr. Driver as fairly chosen types, are greatly lacking in systematic concentration. They eschew severe and exact methods of testing the basal assumptions on which their theory is erected, and scamper generally over the wide field of investigation, flinging up as they go the dust-heaps of a miscellaneous analysis which is often astonishingly inexact. This is strong condemnation of the methods of writers who have assumed the title of "Higher Critics," and it will be for my readers to judge whether I make it good in the following pages. In the meantime, I cite in confirmation of this indictment the judgment of one whose authority to pronounce upon intellectual method will not,

I think, be disputed by any one. Mr. Gladstone, in his volume on "The Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture," says concerning Wellhausen's work on "The Composition of the Hexateuch and the Historical Books": "This work minutely subdivides the Books into smaller portions, and refers these to their different authors, with a self-reliance which appears to be remarkable, but of which I am not a fit judge. I may observe, however, that this work has neither introduction nor conclusion, neither index nor table of contents, and that it resembles *rather the promiscuous gatherings of a note-book, or rather of two note-books crossing one another, discharged bodily into a printing-office*, than a work of regular or scientific criticism. I must add that in certain cases, where the unity of the text is disputed upon grounds alike cognisable by us all, I find the conclusions of the author as *disputable* as they are confident." Dr. Driver's "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament" is substantially modelled upon Wellhausen's method, or lack of method, even as it substantially repeats his conclusions upon the Pentateuch. Dr. Driver has, I observe, supplied a brief introduction, which, however, is rather of the character of another disconnected fragment, and accentuates rather than modifies the miscellaneity of his work. There is a brief index of contents at the end of the book, but it is—and it could not well be otherwise—an index of miscellaneous details. An elaborate index of Hebrew and Aramaic words and

phrases, and another long index of miscellaneous Scripture quotations, scarcely assist in the direction of systematic concentration and definiteness. For the rest, the treatment is that of Wellhausen duplicated, "the promiscuous gatherings of a note-book discharged bodily into a printing-office." Such a promiscuous multiplication of details, hung loosely around some original assumption, and unrelated by any scientifically ascertained principle of unity, is not likely to lead us into the way of truth or to deduce indisputable conclusions. As an example of this uncritical miscellaneity, let any one turn to Dr. Driver's "Introduction." At page 123 he will find the commencement of a list of words and phrases peculiar to those sections which are assigned to P. From that point to page 128 he will find nothing but a miscellaneous catalogue of verbal expressions, without the slightest attempt to relate them in such a logical unity as might either confirm or correct the critic's original assumption. With the first summary assumption of the independence and singularity of P, all really critical scrutiny of these miscellaneous phrases disappears. The possibility of any other principle of unity is practically ignored. In the same unscientific and uncritical spirit, no systematic attempt is made to catalogue and examine the important variations in tone and style within P itself, or the striking passages in which P and JE show a marked resemblance to one another.

Examples of a similar lack of scientific method and precision might be easily multiplied from the pages of such representative critics as Wellhausen, Kuenen, and Dr. Driver, but it is unnecessary to adduce any more at this stage, as such critical delinquencies will be exposed in detail in the course of this discussion.

For the ends of concentration and thoroughness, it will be necessary to limit the scope of our investigation in the present volume to that portion of the Pentateuchal problem which is primarily fundamental and pre-eminently crucial. The adoption of this course will prevent the dissipation of the strength of criticism in ineffective discursiveness, while affording a sufficiently comprehensive range for the attainment of critically decisive results.

By the process of elimination we can discover and define the required arena. It is not the purpose of the present work to demonstrate directly the historical accuracy or general truthfulness of the Pentateuchal records, for the discussion necessary to establish such a positive demonstration would range over a field of many parts and of prodigious extent. It would be necessary to test this remarkable book in relation to Cosmology, Cosmogony, Geology, Ethnology, Philology, Religion, History, and a great many things besides. This elaborate task must be accomplished in parts and by men of special fitness for the office. The partial ineffectiveness of Mr. Gladstone's interesting "Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture" is, I think, largely due to the fact

that it is too discursive; for there is nothing so grateful to the sceptical mind as to be freed from concentration of attention upon the intellectual and spiritual foundations and unities of things, and to be allowed to leap inconsequently from one supposed "difficulty" to another. In a book of less than 300 small pages, to prove that the Mosaic account of the Creation is in harmony with the established deductions of Science; that the whole religious record of the Old Testament is accordant with the profoundest philosophy of religion, and obtains conclusive confirmation of its truthfulness from the developments of christianity; that the Psalms of the Old Testament were Divinely inspired; that the critical "deduction" of the exilic or post-exilic composition of the Priestly Code is contradicted by the broad and undisputed facts of the religious history of Israel; that the Creation story, the Flood story, the record of the great Dispersion, and the details of the Sinaitic journey have all received recent historical or scientific corroboration; that the foundation of a negative or sceptical movement is more spiritual than intellectual;—to prove all this, with an intercalated polemic against Huxley on the Flood and the Gadarene miracle, was far more than even the genius of a Gladstone could satisfactorily perform within such a small compass. The discussion of the problems of the Creation, the Flood, Chronology, minor discrepancies, *et hoc genus omne*, is somewhat venerable and by no means urgent. We therefore

turn to more vital matters, the determination of which, however, will considerably affect the wider outposts of controversy.

The question of the *date* of the authorship of the Pentateuch is admittedly important, but even that does not take first place. For the current critical conclusions concerning the dates of these "documents" depend in great measure upon other conclusions which have been formed upon a problem still more fundamental. This ultimate problem is that of the "unity" of the Pentateuch, and it is to this point that I propose to direct the present investigation.

The essential primacy of this question is well illustrated in the following quotation from Wellhausen's Introduction to his "Prolegomena":—

"Now it is admitted" (observe the facile and complacent assumption!) "that the three constituent elements are separated from each other by wide intervals; the question then arises, In what order? Deuteronomy stands in a relation of comparative nearness both to the Jehovist and to the Priestly Code; the distance between the last two is by far the greatest—so great, that on this ground alone Ewald, as early as the year 1831, declared it impossible that the one could have been written to supplement the other."

It may be pointed out that the above declaration is accepted by Dr. Driver, and the christian critics who agree with him, as one of those fully demon-

strated conclusions which would be at once accepted "on any neutral ground" by all men of sense and intelligence. It is obvious, therefore, that, if the Compilation Theory of independent and discrepant documents be critically destroyed, the problem of dates will undergo very important modification. The direct investigation of the *data* from which the date of the Pentateuch may be inferred must therefore be left over until the prior problem of its organic unity has been dealt with.

The present writer also deems it a necessary condition of effectiveness to conduct his critical examination in the particular and peculiar ground occupied by modern criticism, that is, to deal with precisely the same *data* as the Higher Criticism has chosen for the deduction of its destructive conclusions;—the *data* supplied by the employment of different names for God, by variations and resemblances in style and diction, by alleged discrepancies and redundancies, and those other minute features which have been paraded as proving beyond dispute the affirmations of the Higher Critics. By their own *critéria* they must be judged.

That the hour calls for the performance of this particular task in this particular form is evidenced by the contemptuous inattention of the critics to arguments, however weighty and considerable, which are based upon more general considerations. It is of no avail to remind the Higher Critic that in the matter of the origin and development of that world-

shaping religion which fashioned the utterances of the Hebrew prophets and culminated in Jesus Christ, we stand within the reach of argumentative considerations of scope so wide, and authority so weighty, as might justly be regarded as more than sufficient to convict the Higher Critics of having bungled in the labyrinth of the complicated details of their microscopic operations. The tremendous argument which is presented in the unique relation sustained by the Hebrew religion to the supernatural Christ is ignored or evaded even by those "christian" critics who professedly accept the Christ as "God manifest in the flesh." The far-reaching and weighty argument which demonstrates that the theory of "pious deception" (which is an essential part of the "established conclusions" of criticism) is altogether incompatible with the character of the books themselves, or with any reverent conception of the credentials of a Divinely imparted religion, is evaded by unconvincing ingenuities. Mr. Gladstone, in his "Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture," develops a strong chain of reasoning to prove that under the known relations of priest and prophet in the history of the kingdoms of Israel, it is not conceivable that the priests could have been allowed to ascribe to Moses a ritual and history of their own making. Mr. Gladstone was no mean thinker, even when compared with Wellhausen and his followers, and there are many thoughtful people to whom the argument which he elaborates will carry conviction. Yet,

though it strikes at the heart of the problem, Dr. Driver does not deign to favour it with his notice. In fact, Mr. Gladstone puts himself out of court, in the eyes of the critics, in his opening sentence: "It is a serious question how far one ignorant, like myself, of Hebrew, and having no regular practice in the study and explanation of the text of the Old Testament, is entitled to attempt representations concerning it, which must present more or less the character of advice, to any portion of his fellow-countrymen." Upon the man, whoever he may be, who confesses that he is not a Hebrew scholar, and who imagines that the sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament may possibly be related to greater things even than Hebrew scholarship, the Higher Critic blandly bestows an excommunicating smile. The professional critic is wholly engrossed with the minutiae of his dissecting table; the sweep of the skies does not concern him.

In no case is this peculiar limitedness of the Higher Critic more clearly apparent than in Dr. Driver's treatment of that important conservative critic, Keil. The following passage from Dr. Driver's Preface to his "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament" is singularly naïve and suggestive—

"Polemical references, with very few exceptions, I have avoided: in this case, the limitation of space coincided *with my own inclinations*. It must not, however, be thought that, because I do not more

frequently discuss divergent opinions, I am therefore unacquainted with them. I have been especially careful to acquaint myself with the views of Keil, and of other writers on the traditional side. Upon no occasion have I adopted what may be termed a critical as opposed to a conservative position, without weighing the arguments advanced in support of the latter, and satisfying *myself* that they were untenable."

That last papal sentence is delicious. But even the commencement of the cited paragraph was instinct with promise. The avoidance of polemical reference to a powerful opponent like Keil "coincided *with my own inclinations.*" Thus decides the authority of Dr. Driver. And what more can his readers desire? Some uninstructed persons might imagine that it is the business of a critic, who would assist thinking people to arrive at correct conclusions, to lay the case evenly and comprehensively before them, giving them an opportunity of judging for *themselves* as to the soundness of his arguments. Some may be even unreasonable enough to think that the writing of a critical book which does not conform to this condition is worse than useless, is positively vicious. But these crude notions are now happily exploded, like many other ideas, by the Higher Critics. The assured road into certain truth lies in the *ipse dixit* of the critic, after he has interviewed his opponents *in camera*, and recited his rebutting arguments to

his own inner consciousness. This is, no doubt, another phase of "advanced" criticism. As a matter of fact, Dr. Driver treats Keil, and other scholarly opponents of the Compilation Theory, with scant courtesy. It was no superfluous sentence in which he assured us that he knew Keil's writings, for, judging from his book, I should most positively have come to the conclusion that he was but slightly acquainted with the important criticisms of that writer. I am unable to place my finger upon a single instance where Dr. Driver seriously states and meets any one of the pregnant criticisms of his great antagonist. On the contrary, in his analysis of the Pentateuch Dr. Driver repeats representation after representation, as though they were beyond question, in regard to which, in a great number of cases, if Keil's effective criticisms were set side by side with Dr. Driver's *ex cathedra* pronouncements, I am confident that no small number of the readers of the latter would satisfy *themselves* that it is not Keil's, but Dr. Driver's, positions that are most frequently "untenable." The contemptuous attitude of the latter towards the former writer is well illustrated in the following brief paragraph, one of the very few references to Keil which I have noticed in the book: "Keil, Green, and Bissell represent the traditional view of the origin and structure of the Pentateuch. The reason why this cannot be maintained is, stated briefly, the presence in the Hexateuch (and in other parts of

the Old Testament) of *too many facts which conflict with it.*"

That is superb contempt, but it is not criticism. It is matter for reflection when one sees a man of Dr. Driver's mould lapse into that critical arrogance which the Higher Criticism has steadily developed. Such a summary dismissal of one's critical opponents as blind men that cannot see is indefensible. Dr. Keil, being a truly great critic, and finding the "facts" irreconcilable with the Compilation Theory, might have ignored the advocates of that theory in the same pontifical manner, but he was too true a critic to do so. If Dr. Driver's critical works are to have any practical value, he must descend from this lofty pedestal, and satisfy *others* as well as *himself* that the critical objections to his analyses and theories have been met and overcome.

III

ORGANIC UNITY

IT is now necessary to characterise with precision the elements which the organic unity of the Pentateuch necessarily involves. It will be obvious to every just thinker that it does not necessarily involve immunity from textual corruption in any of the many ways in which such corruption has been possible during the long history of this ancient document. It is also plain that it does not of necessity exclude a later arrangement of the original composition into a more fixed and determinate unity, or such literary indications (say, certain clearly marked interpolations) as may accord with such an operation. Assuming, merely for the sake of illustration, that Moses, with coadjutors acting under the dominating influence of his organising mind, wrote the contents, broadly speaking, of the present Pentateuch, and that the succession in maintaining the sacred record of events passed on to Joshua and his coadjutors, who had been trained in the spiritual, mental, and literary school of the great lawgiver; it is highly probable that, under the unsettled and disturbed circumstances of those days, the writings,

however exhaustive, could not then have been finally welded into a complete and systematic literary unity. They would be substantially complete, and would sufficiently indicate the fundamental principles on which their unity was fashioned, but the last touch of systematisation would be lacking. There is no date in the turbulent history of the Judges when such a task could have been performed. But it would most certainly be accomplished in the first settled period of the history of Israel when literature could be systematically produced and pursued. Such a period is said to have arrived in the reigns of David and Solomon; and it may be worth noting by the way that, if it could be shown that the indications given in the Pentateuch respecting its final systematisation point conclusively to the days of David or Solomon, and reach by implication back to older documents, it would be clearly demonstrated that the records of the Pentateuch were contemporary with the events which they narrate. This, however, is only a passing suggestion, as I am not engaged in this volume in ascertaining the date of the composition of the Pentateuch, although the results we shall obtain will have an important bearing on that further quest. It is also obvious that, if any sections of the Pentateuch were misplaced in the final arrangement, so that certain passages may be found more or less out of their strict context, the substantial unity of the whole is in no way impaired.

I must go still further, and point out that, if the final systematisers of the original writings deemed it well in gathering them together to round them off into final completeness by indicating some fact which confirmed the ancient narrative, or by quoting in illustration or corroboration of the records some parallel testimony from associated poetical documents, the unity of the Pentateuch as an organically homogeneous production is not substantially affected. By maintaining the organic unity of the Pentateuch, I mean to affirm that, taking it as a whole, and not necessarily including every thrum and detail and embellishment, it is the consistent and intelligent production of a single mind.

It is, if possible, more obvious still, that the organic unity of the composition does not prescribe any exclusive method by which the composer must have obtained the materials for his work. A genuine composer, as distinguished from a mere compiler, is not excluded, any more than the latter, from the employment of pre-existing material, in documentary form or otherwise. A composer and a compiler may use the same material, but the difference between the two operations is radical: the latter produces a fantastic patchwork, a miscellaneity without articulation; the former creates an inter-related living organism. Shakespeare made use of all the pre-existing materials upon which he could lay his hands, and much of the material which he utilised is now known to us, but his plays are no nearer being

compilations on that account. This, then, is the essence of the present question. The Compilation Theory affirms that the Pentateuch is a miscellaneity, a mere compilation; I maintain, in opposition, that it is a genuine composition, an organic unity.

I know of no better illustration of this essential distinction than that which is given in the controversy which Wolf initiated concerning Homer's "Iliad." Every classical student knows that Wolf did with the "Iliad" precisely what the Higher Critics have done with the Pentateuch. As the latter have found the blessed name of Ezra, so Wolf found the blessed name of Pisistratus. Some epigrammatist of antiquity had declared that "Pisistratus collected Homer, who was formerly *sung* in fragments," and straightway Wolf analysed the "Iliad" into loose and independent songs which he supposed to have been sung in disconnected lays for centuries before they were stitched together by the Ezra of Greece. All that remained of Homer was an unsubstantial name. This Higher Criticism of the "Iliad" was brought to perfection by Lachmann, who discovered in the poem sixteen independent "lays," with enlargements and interpolations, all finally reduced to order by Pisistratus. And so the Compilation Theory of the "Iliad" reached its climax.

These speculations sound very homely and familiar to us after a course of the Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch; and it is as suggestive as it is interesting

to compare the sequel. The methods employed in both cases are precisely of the same kind, and the conclusions are almost exactly parallel. These methods can obviously be applied by Western minds with far greater accuracy and certainty upon a Greek poem reflecting the cardinal characteristics of Occidental thought than upon an ancient Oriental document embodying literary forms and principles which are remote from Western conception and practice. Clearly, if it is reasonable to admit uncertainty for such critical results, the greater uncertainty must lie in the criticism of the products of the Orient, and not in the criticism of a Western poem. Yet who is there that demands that every scholar shall assent to the Compilation Theory of the "Iliad," or be drummed out of the charmed circle of the "critics"? In fact, in spite of the ingenious "proofs" of Wolf and Lachmann, I believe there is little risk in affirming that most intelligent students of Homer still regard the great "Iliad" as a genuine composition by a master-mind, and not as a mere compilation of disconnected lays. Yet in the far more difficult case of a remote Oriental document such scepticism of critical results is declared to be unlawful, and the *fiat* has gone forth that they can no longer be questioned without incurring intellectual ostracism. Here is a distinct test of Dr. Driver's contention that "the same conclusions, upon any *neutral ground of investigation*, would have been accepted without hesitation by all conversant with the subject." We have seen that on

such *neutral ground* as the "Iliad" similar critical results have been left open, or ignored, or repudiated. It is on the non-neutral ground of the Pentateuch that these theories have become despotic, for the reason that a great number of thinkers who would speak and think boldly and independently on neutral ground, are afraid of being independent on the Pentateuch, lest they should be thought religiously narrow, prejudiced, and bigoted. The wholesome balance which criticism maintains on neutral ground is disturbed in the case of the Pentateuch by the piquant relish of self-conscious audacity on the one hand, and on the other hand by the timidity which shrinks from the stigma of narrowness. In practice, then, Dr. Driver's *dictum* has been reversed. In the case of the Pentateuch, the Compilation Theory is forced upon us, and we are significantly told that it has been accepted by all critics of any consideration. In the neutral ground of the "Iliad," a similar theory has been left an open question, and most people have rejected it. Would that the Pentateuch were approached in the same impartial and enlightened spirit as that which prevails upon "neutral ground!"

In order to establish the organic unity of the Pentateuch, it will be necessary to demonstrate the critical untenability of the grounds upon which the "documents" enumerated and defined by the Higher Criticism are declared to be disclosed. But it will neither be necessary nor desirable in the limits of the present volume to deal with every one of the

supposed documents, even if it were (as it is not) the case that the critics had made up their minds upon the exact number. It is impossible, for example, to discover in the agonising wrestlings of Dr. Driver in certain parts of Exodus how many "documents" he imagines to be imbedded in the narrative. And, generally, the usual way of getting over a difficulty in the Higher Criticism is found in the prompt assumption of another "document." To attempt to follow the Higher Criticism in its mazy meanderings among miscellaneous documents, old and new, would be simply a ramble round the world which could not lead to any definite destination. The remedy for the present confusion is to force the maximum of definiteness and concentration. There are certain main "documents" which are crucial to the problem. If the assumption of these particular documents can be shown to be critically untenable, the refutation of the Compilation Theory will have been accomplished, and the remaining documents will fade away for want of adequate support. Having singled out these fundamental documents, we shall subject them to precise and definite scrutiny, rejecting all the bye-ways of discursive miscellaneity until our end is attained.

The main documents with which we shall deal are the three which have been labelled J, E, and P. It will be necessary to consider along with these the "compilers" who are supposed to have joined them together, and to have assisted or embellished the

jointures with certain literary additions of their own. The minor divisions, or documents, are but dependent offshoots, and can be ignored for our present purpose. Even D, the Deuteronomist, let alone the fraternity of Deuteronomists, can be omitted with advantage in the present examination. The discussion of the large question of Deuteronomy will take us too far away from the vital centre of J, and E, and P. Besides, if the organic unity of J, E, and P be proved, the critical assumption of the "Deuteronomist" is destroyed at the same time, for that theory is cardinally based upon the far separation of P from JE. It is, therefore, obvious that the whole foundation of the Compilation Theory is to be found in the deduction of the documents J, E, and P. The overthrow of this deduction involves the overthrow of the whole theory.

The foregoing facts enable us to give our investigation a still more definite character, for the main basis for the deduction of these three crucial documents lies in the book of Genesis and the first few chapters of Exodus. It is admitted that these documents are less clearly distinguished in the remaining portions of the Pentateuch, and that the grand and conclusive proof of their separateness is discovered and disclosed in Genesis. It is in Genesis that J and E are distinguished by the characteristic employment of the names Jahveh and Elohim respectively, and it is in Genesis that P is also distinguished from J by a similar characteristic use of Elohim. It

is in Genesis also that the contrast between the style of P and JE is most striking and obtrusive, and it is in Genesis that some of the most celebrated "discrepancies" are found which are supposed to prove the duality of J and E. Clearly, therefore, if we can demonstrate the organic unity of these documents in this Paradise of distinction and separation, their unity in the remainder of the Pentateuch follows as a matter of course.

It will still be open to me, however, to enforce my conclusions with arguments drawn from a wider field, and with citations of capital import from other parts of the Pentateuch. Such arguments must all be brought to the touch-stone of the Pentateuch itself. If the argument be of a literary character, it must be tested by the literary indications furnished in the Pentateuchal writings. If it have a moral basis, it must be tried by the moral principles which are found in the Pentateuch. This natural and obvious test seems to me to be frequently evaded by those that speak for the Higher Criticism. A concrete illustration will bring out my meaning more clearly. In the building up of the Compilation Theory it is one of the necessary cardinal assumptions that "Deuteronomy" was not written till the time of Josiah; that, after it was written, it was purposely "hidden" in the temple, in order that it might be "found" there a little later, and become regarded through this ruse as a sacred book which had been actually written by Moses under immediate inspiration and revelation

from God. Concerning this elaborate device to deceive the people into accepting a recent composition as an ancient oracle of God, Dr. Driver says: "The author, in framing discourses appropriate to Moses' situation, especially if, as is *probable*, the elements were provided for him by tradition, would be doing nothing inconsistent with the literary usages of his age and people." In this deftly framed sentence, Dr. Driver has cleverly evaded the real point. If it was "consistent with the literary usages of the age" of Josiah to "frame discourses" supposed to be "appropriate to Moses' situation," why frame also all this elaborate arrangement of fraudulent hide-and-seek to conceal such a *legitimate* operation from the people, and to delude them into believing that the document had been written by Moses himself? I will not elaborate this clear point, but it will serve as another illustration of that *elusive* critical, or rather uncritical, method against which I am specially anxious to warn those who proceed to examine the arguments put forward by the Higher Critics. I have seen even in the writings of men of less eminence in criticism than Dr. Driver such a smug sentence as this: "The charge of forgery will not be entertained by *those of us* who are acquainted with the literary customs of the East."

This naïve self-complacency and easy assumption of peculiar and exclusive acquaintance with Oriental literary custom must not, of course, be taken seriously by any one who desires to deal with these

matters in a genuinely critical spirit. These gentlemen know no more about Oriental usages than other people, and they cannot be allowed to intermingle their personal preconceptions with the rigid processes of criticism. The principles of exact criticism demand that critics shall seek in the Pentateuch itself, and that with open mind, the *data* for deciding the literary and moral principles of the period. Neither Dr. Driver nor any one else has any adequate means of becoming acquainted with the literary usages and moral ideas of the time when the Pentateuch was written except by an unbiassed investigation of the Pentateuchal writings themselves.

IV . .

JAHVIST AND ELOHIST

THE paths of immortality are many and various. Wellhausen, in his article on the "Pentateuch" in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," says that Jean Astruc has the merit of opening the true path of this investigation, by recognising in Genesis two main "sources," which he distinguished by the mark that the one used for God the name Elohim, and the other the name Jahveh. Astruc's glory is, however, greatly dimmed, because he still held the apparently reasonable belief that Moses might well have made use of these sources in a genuine composition. The immortal fame which Astruc thus forfeited fell, according to Wellhausen, in a golden shower on the brow of De Wette. I take the exact words from the "Encyclopædia Britannica": "De Wette refuses to find any history in the Pentateuch; all is legend and poetry. . . . De Wette's brilliant *début*, which made his reputation for the rest of his life, exercised a powerful influence on his contemporaries." It now becomes our task to examine the foundations on which such glory has been built up.

I ask my readers to divest their minds of all

thoughts of a "consensus," and of the authority of scholars, and to apply themselves simply and without prejudice to the consideration of the probability or improbability of the assumptions made by the Compilation Theory, just as if these were now for the first time presented for consideration. We will follow these assumptions step by step, and consider their tenability at each stage, and venture to premise that such a cumulation of improbabilities has seldom been forced into the service of any theory in any domain of investigation.

The first cardinal assumption of the Compilation Theory is, that three great histories of God's government of the world were written by three different individuals, or sets of individuals, in the land of Israel, and that these can be distinguished by the single name for God which each writer selected to employ in his particular history. One writer, though composing a history in which God is revealed in a variety of important relations to men, confines himself so closely to the single name Jahveh that his document can be distinguished by that peculiarity. Another writer, traversing practically the same varied ground, is narrowed down to the exclusive employment of the term Elohim. And yet another writer, with a great story to narrate of God's dealings with the world, is tied down to the same limited and inelastic nomenclature. Let this most strange hypothesis be fairly considered, and it will be seen how remote it is from verisimilitude, how singularly

opposed to the psychology of literature. Such an amazing idiosyncrasy as this artificial limitation can surely find no parallel in any of the great literatures of the world! The writing of a comprehensive and varied record of God's dealings with the world would demand a large liberty in reference to His name, a splendid elasticity of nomenclature to express varying relations and conceptions. That such liberty was not demanded and enjoyed in the composition of all sections of a great literary work like the Pentateuch is, to say the least, highly improbable. The artificial and unparalleled restriction assumed by the Compilation Theory is, from the standpoint of the psychology of literature, all but unthinkable.

The inherent improbability of such a peculiar restriction is heightened by the fact that the theory is compelled to deny the existence of any special psychological relation between the particular name for God selected by a given writer and the history which he narrates. For the interpretation of the different names for God as implying varying relations would point to the distinguishing operations of a single mind, and contradict the theory of individual idiosyncrasy. Looked at simply, and without reference to assumptions which shall be considered in due course, it appears to me a supposition of the highest degree of improbability that the two supposed writers, J and E, should, while writing histories broadly identical in scope, style, diction, phraseology, and intention, develop this

peculiar idiosyncrasy of the single name in strongly opposite directions. I am certain that there is no parallel to this violent singularity in the literature of the world.

I have by no means reached the climax in the ascent of improbabilities involved in this peculiar assumption of "single name" historians. But, before pressing the matter further in that direction, we will pause to consider the main ground on which this singular hypothesis is justified and explained. It is maintained that the Pentateuch itself gives the *raison d'être* of this peculiarity in the employment of specific divine names, and thus demonstrates the correctness of the theory. One cannot treat the Higher Critics more fairly than by allowing Kuenen to state the case in his own words:—

"In Exodus vi. 2, 3, Elohim declares that He had revealed Himself to the patriarchs as El Shaddai, and He reveals His name of Jahveh—unquestionably for the first time, according to the writer—to Moses. Something similar is likewise to be found in Exodus iii. 13–15, in a narrative which cannot be due to the same author as Exodus vi. 2, 3. The writers who cherished this belief concerning the name Jahveh could not represent either God Himself, in the pre-Mosaic times, or the people who were then living, as using this name; and in all probability they would themselves avoid it in the narratives that referred to this earlier period. . . . As a matter of fact, the texts themselves show that they use Elohim

throughout; and the rule is so precise that in the few passages in their narratives where Jahveh now stands we *need not hesitate to ascribe it to the later manipulation or corruption of the text.*" I have italicised the last words to call attention to the facile and summary way in which the Higher Critic proposes to dispose of embarrassing difficulties. The rule of the exclusive use of Elohim is to be made precise by unhesitatingly deleting all that contradicts it! This effective critical method will receive our attention later on. We shall, for the present, ignore Kuenen's confident assertion that Exod. iii. 13-15 cannot be due to the same author as Exod. vi. 2, 3, as the question of unity or variety of authorship is the main end of the present investigation. Let us turn to the assertion that the writer, or writers, of Exod. iii. 13-15 and vi. 2, 3, believed that the name Jahveh as applied to God was not known before the days of Moses. I unreservedly admit that, if such a statement is really made in the above passages, it must be another writer that so frequently uses the name Jahveh in the book of Genesis, and the peculiar improbability which appeared to attach to the "single name" theory is explained away. On the other hand, if the passages do not clearly give that sense, not only does the improbability which I have demonstrated remain, but the very roots of the Compilation Theory will be cut away. Improbabilities will speedily be multiplied upon it.

It cannot, in my judgment, escape from this doom, for the passages cited do certainly *not* contain the statement which Kuenen attributes to them. Let us first take Exod. vi. 2, 3. The words are: "And God spake unto Moses, and said unto Him, I am Jahveh. And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, in (*the name or character of*) El Shaddai, but, as to my name Jahveh, I was not made known to them." It is only by careless treatment unworthy of one claiming to be a critic that Kuenen's interpretation could have been put into these profound words. To express his meaning quite another form of words would have been required. The words, "I am Jahveh," do not indicate the enunciation of an unknown name, but rather suggest previous familiarity; as in Isa. xlii. 8, "I am Jahveh: that is my name." The phrase, "my name Jahveh," clearly alludes to a name familiarly known. There is no hint in the passage that this name, as a term applied to God, was not previously current. What the words declare is an entirely different thing, namely, that *God Himself* had not been known to the patriarchs, in reference to (*i.e.* in the character or content of) His name Jahveh. God does not say (as Kuenen would have Him say), "The name Jahveh was unknown to the patriarchs," but, rather, "In reference to my name Jahveh, *I* was not made known to them." The difference is immense, and perfectly clear and distinct. It is further to be noticed that the opposition

in the passage is between Jahveh and El Shaddai, and not between Jahveh and Elohim. The name Jahveh was now selected to take the place, not of Elohim, but of El Shaddai. The importance of this distinction will appear before the close of our investigation. Keil asserts that the *proton pseudos* of the Compilation Theory lurks in the failure to distinguish between Elohim and El Shaddai, and certainly one of its first and worst fallacies has its ambush there. The cited passage gives no ground for the exclusive or special use of Elohim, as it only deals with the psychological relation of the name Jahveh with the name El Shaddai.

Exod. iii. 13-15 needs only brief treatment. Kuenen's uncritical heedlessness in rushing to conclusions that suit his theory is well illustrated in his treatment of this passage. After alluding to Exod. vi. 2, 3, he says, "Something similar is likewise to be found in Exod. iii. 13-15." "Something similar." What beautiful scientific precision! In a subsequent note on this passage he says: "In the beginning of the narrative, *as it now stands*, the name Jahveh is repeatedly employed (Exod. iii. 2, 4, 7). But in vv. 11 and 13 Moses addresses Ha-Elohim, and is answered by Him in vv. 12, 14, 15. So when Moses asks what he is to reply if the Israelites ask the name of Him who sent him, and therefore hears the name Ahjeh (ver. 14) for which Jahveh is immediately substituted (ver. 15), we can but *suppose* that this name had never

been revealed previously, and was now for the first time communicated to Moses, and by him to the people."

The slipshod character of the foregoing paragraph, in which Kuenen desperately ends by "supposing" the conclusion which he has set out to find, is patent even at the first glance. But, as it affords a good illustration of those hardy violations of critical law by which the Higher Criticism has reached so many of its conclusions, it demands a little closer examination. It is all but, if not absolutely, vital to Kuenen's Compilation Theory that he should be able to prove that Exod. iii. 13-15 asserts the communication of the sacred name Jahveh to Moses and the children of Israel *for the first time*. Unless this can be proved, no sane reason can be assigned for the assumed avoidance of that name by the supposed writer E in the previous history. What is Kuenen's critical method of procedure? He finds that "in the beginning of the narrative" (vv. 2, 4, 7) (though the supposed *first* communication of the name Jahveh is not made until ver. 14) "the name Jahveh is repeatedly employed." Kuenen evidently perceives that this is fatal to his theory of first communication, for the Elohist would clearly not employ the name Jahveh familiarly, as one already known, in the beginning of this narrative, when he was on the point of introducing the *first* solemn and awful communication of that supreme name. A truly critical mind, with no interest save that of truth,

free from the bondage of a pet theory, would have accepted this incontrovertible fact as final, and frankly admitted that the hypothesis of a first communication of the name Jahveh being narrated in this passage was a mistaken one. But the surrender of a theory to facts is not Kuenen's method. *The objectionable facts must be deleted.* It is the narrative, *as it now stands*, that is fatal to Kuenen's theory; and, of course, if the narrative, as it now stands, dares to contradict his hypotheses, it must be made to stand otherwise. I have already quoted his dictum that, "in the few passages in their (the Elo-histic) narratives where Jahveh *now stands* we need not hesitate to ascribe it to the later manipulation or corruption of the text."

I put it to the judgment of my readers whether conclusions obtained by such violent, arbitrary, and uncritical methods can be regarded as possessing any assignable value. For myself, I must, in the name of genuine criticism, reiterate my demand that critical theories shall be judged by the Pentateuch *as it now stands*, and that any alterations shall be demanded by much weightier considerations than the exigencies of a theory.

But even this inadmissible evasion does not avail him in this instance; for the name given by God to Moses was not Jahveh, but Ahjeh; not the name Jahveh, but the connotation or explanation of it; and certainly the explanation of a name comes by natural position after the general knowledge of the

name itself. On account of this previous knowledge, it was possible to introduce the proper name Jahveh in verse 15, in a familiar way, without causing any confusion between the real name and its connotation. Were it not for this, God's supremely announced title would have appeared to Moses to be Ahjeh rather than Jahveh; for the former was announced with the greatest emphasis and august formality. The whole passage, therefore, by the free use of the name Jahveh before the supposed communication was made, by its abrupt *explanation* of the name Jahveh as a term already known, and by its generally free and familiar use of this particular name, is altogether at variance with the conclusion which Kuenen "could but suppose."

The explanation, which these passages were supposed to give, of the singular literary behaviour of the two Elohist in avoiding through a long history the lofty name Jahveh, has vanished on close and rigid critical examination, and the theory is left suspended with all its weight of inherent improbability. But what explanation can be even "supposed" for the eccentric conduct of the Jahvist, who rushes violently to the opposite pole of singularity, and obtrusively shuns the employment of the strong, majestic, and generally used, name of Elohim for God? It is not contended, even by the Higher Critic, that this supposed author confined himself *exclusively* to the employment of the name Jahveh for the Deity. Not all the arbitrariness and violence

in the world can enable the Higher Critic to deprive the Jahvistic section of certain of its Elohistie passages, so he has to be content with ascribing to this "document" a "preference" for the term Jahveh. But such a vague conception as general *preference* is too indefinite to serve as a criterion for the determined and exact discrimination and classification of documents, and the Higher Criticism is nothing if not positive. Therefore, to suit its own ends, and in violation of critical circumspection, it treats the indefinite as definite, and tears away from the Jahvistic section every passage containing the term Elohim which can by any force be detached from it. Such a course may be required for the maintenance of the Compilation Theory, but not even the Higher Critics pretend that there is any warrant *in the Pentateuch* for treating the use of the term Jahveh in this section as practically exclusive. "Preference" and "exclusiveness" may be leagues apart. Kuenen, in his usual unprecise and careless fashion, says concerning the employment of the name Jahveh: "Gen. iv. 26 makes it very probable that this is connected with a different idea as to the antiquity of the name of Jahveh." The passage to which he refers is: "Then began men to call upon the name of Jahveh." If Kuenen had exercised just a little of the critical faculty upon this passage, he would have seen that the sacred writer did not mean this verse to stand for the explanation and starting-point of the use of the name

Jahveh, for the writer had already constantly used that name from the 4th verse of the 2nd chapter, and had even represented Eve as making use of it in the 1st verse of the 4th chapter. Kuenen's appeal, therefore, to Gen. iv. 26 as an explanation of J's use of the word Jahveh is critically worthless. Besides, the statement that men began to call upon the name of Jahveh does not in the least imply the disuse or neglect of the great name Elohim. Jahveh, the covenant Redeemer of His people, remains still and for ever Elohim, the all-ruling and universal God. Jahveh may surpass and supersede El Shaddai, for the latter but marked a stage in the self-revelation of Elohim to men, but Elohim marks no partial stage of special revelation; it marks, on the contrary, the eternal, universal, and unchanging ground out of which all special revelations spring. The attempt to make Jahveh and Elohim mutually exclusive is a fatal policy which vitiates the Compilation Theory in its very beginnings.

The theoretical support claimed as given in the Pentateuch itself for the "single name" hypothesis having entirely failed under critical examination, it will be speedily seen that the cumulative improbabilities of that theory are so great that one might be easily pardoned for regarding it as critically discredited and even overthrown at this early stage. These improbabilities we shall now demonstrate in order.

A very grave critical difficulty in the severance

of J and E lies in the remarkable literary and other likeness between them. The critics have "agreed" in concluding that J was written in the Southern, and E in the Northern, kingdom, and that their date must be placed somewhere near the close of the existence of the latter kingdom. I put this last statement broadly, on account of the uncertainty of the critics on that point. Dr. Driver's words are: "Although, however, critics differ as to the *relative* date of J and E, they agree that neither is later than about 750 B.C." Judging from the usual practice of the Higher Criticism, we may confidently assume that this latest possible date will be the one ultimately "agreed" upon. Now, concerning these two "documents" Dr. Driver confesses early in his "Introduction" that, "other phraseological criteria" (except the peculiar distinction in the designation for God) "are slight." This is a tremendous admission, when its implication is unfolded. It obviously means (and every student of Genesis knows that it is rigidly correct) that J and E are, in style, diction, phraseology, manner, method, mannerism, atmosphere, conception, and intention, indistinguishable except by the ingenious subtleties of a microscopic analysis. The subtle critic, after much painful labour, has to confess that, after eliminating the peculiar hypothesis of the "single name," "other phraseological criteria are *slight*."

In the name of honest criticism, can it be the

same man who, on a later page of the same book, makes the following observation?—"The similarity of the two narratives, *such as it is*, is sufficiently explained by the fact that their subject-matter is (approximately) the same, and that they both originated in the same general period of Israelitish literature." It is clear that Dr. Driver's "Introduction" is really compiled out of two independent and discrepant "documents" flung together by a bungling "Compiler" who possessed no sense of glaring discrepancies. The admission of the virtual identity in phraseology of J and E must have been written by D¹, and the almost scornful depreciation of that similarity by D². I earnestly ask my readers to consider whether a method and spirit of criticism which can produce such a statement as I have quoted above can be even regarded seriously. The embarrassing literary likeness between J and E cannot be denied even by Dr. Driver, except in obscure innuendo. Were it not for the intrusion of a separation hypothesis, few scholars, I think, would find any difficulty in discovering the style of these sections to be actually identical. Yet what is Dr. Driver's "critical" explanation? First, the style is naturally similar, because the subject-matter is (approximately) so. Was there ever such a statement made in the whole range of literary criticism? Because two different individuals, independent authors, remote in life and abode from one another, happen to write on the same theme,

they must, as a matter of course, or at least of probability, compose with such remarkable literary similarity, that it is difficult to find any "phraseological criteria" to distinguish them from one another! When, for example, Emerson and Carlyle wrote on a kindred theme, their style would naturally become virtually identical! Dr. Driver's supplementary explanation is marked by the same vague inconsequence. He says, "They both originated in the same general period of Israelitish literature." As if the broad features of a "general" period of literature accounted for minute similarity of style and diction and phraseology in the compositions of two individual and independent authors! Add to this inconsequence that Dr. Driver has forgotten to observe that, if J was written in the Southern kingdom, and E in the Northern kingdom at any late date in its history, then these writers were trained under widely divergent influences, and wrote their different compositions in countries which had drifted far from one another in circumstances, ideas, and general atmosphere. Under such conditions, indistinguishableness, or even a startling similarity, of diction and style and phraseology is, to put it mildly, a literary and psychological mystery.

Dr. Driver's uncandid treatment of this important point is thrown into greater relief by Kuenen's frank admission of the difficulty; for on this point the latter is more intellectually candid than the former. Kuenen says: "It is urged . . . that E and J are

too much alike to have been written independently of each other." This contention he does not attempt to dispute; for the simple reason that (with all respect to Dr. Driver) it is not reasonably disputable. If it were not beyond fair controversy, my readers may judge with what promptitude and satisfaction Kuenen would have challenged it. What cannot be denied Kuenen essays to explain in the following terms: "But no one denies that J may have known and *imitated* E, or *vice versa*." Dr. Driver essays the hopeless task of maintaining the independency of J and E; Kuenen perceives and frankly admits that if their identity be denied, their dependency must, of necessity, be conceded.

There is no critical escape from this concession, yet it immediately augments the improbabilities of the "single name" theory. For it is admitted that the one of these writers must have been so well acquainted with, and must have so greatly admired, the composition of the other, as to set himself to "imitate" that composition so slavishly and minutely that "phraseological criteria" for distinguishing the one from the other are "slight." Yet the "imitator," while so completely surrendering himself to this dominating literary influence in all other respects, remains entirely uninfluenced by it in his use of the Divine name, and persists in his own narrow-grooved singularity in stubborn opposition to the document which he so sedulously imitates!

It might seem all but impossible to adduce a

greater literary improbability than the foregoing, yet there is a still greater deep in this "single name" hypothesis. The Higher Criticism, being constantly pressed by difficulties, has been compelled to go on making fresh assumptions to prevent its original suppositions from collapsing. When its single Elohist refused to bear the strain of examination, it straightway assumed a second Elohist. In the same manner, when the single Jahvist theory was seen to be inconsistent with the contents of the Pentateuch, another "Jahvist" was created, and was assigned the function of "Compiler" of J and E. Kuenen speaks of this new writer as a commentator, or harmonist, and says: "But this harmonist, though he too uses the name Jahveh, must certainly be distinguished from J." I venture to assert that the only reason for this distinction is the necessity of saving from collapse the original assumption of the separateness of the documents J and E. This aspect of the matter will, however, be dealt with later, and I shall at this stage confine myself to pointing out the extraordinary conduct of the J Compiler. As a literary curiosity he crowns the edifice of improbability. He is supposed to be the man who, with admirable impartiality, stitched portions of the documents J and E together in transparently discrepant and contradictory patches, evincing his literary catholicity by allowing the different "exclusive" names for God to stand unmodified in the baldest contrast with one another.

Yet this amazingly unprejudiced "Compiler," when he desired to interject a sentence of his own, was, without any conceivable reason, such an extreme devotee of the "single name" cult, that he employed the name Jahveh in the baldest and abruptest fashion to wind up an Elohist story. The Compilation Theory is compelled to assign Gen. xx. 18 to this remarkable "Compiler." My readers have only to read that chapter through, to feel the full force and justice of my representation. There never was such a literary freak as this J Compiler before, nor will any such ever appear again.

I conclude this demonstration of the extreme improbability of the "single name" theory with the obvious remark that it is entirely opposed to the whole tone and tenor of the Pentateuch itself. No reader can deny that the nomenclature of the Pentateuch is, in all its sections, deeply imbued with psychological import. In the nomenclature of individuals, the greatest prominence is given to the signification and the significance of names, and it is extremely improbable that such a fruitful principle should be neglected in the employment of Divine names. Not only so, but there are many cases beyond dispute of such psychological employment of Divine titles in the Pentateuch, cases which even the Higher Critics are compelled to admit. And we have seen that in that crowning revelation of *Himself* which God gave to Moses, as recorded in

Exod. vi. and iii., the treatment of the Divine names is profoundly psychological.

Critically, then, the "single name" theory is weighted at the very outset with such a load of improbabilities that one may reasonably regard it as untenable unless these improbabilities can be countervailed by evidence gathered from other data and other facts. It is affirmed that the "single name" theory is confirmed by the actual contents of the "documents" as they appear in the Pentateuch; we will proceed at once, therefore, to carry our investigation into that domain.

V

THE EVIDENCE OF THE "DOCUMENTS" REGARDING THE "SINGLE NAME"

THE advocates of the Compilation Theory announce as their triumphant and conclusive demonstration that the documents which they distinguish are actually found to employ the "single name," in accordance with the theory. Let us put the "documents" to the proof. The Jahveh document shall receive our first attention. The first section of this document is affirmed to extend from Gen. ii. 4*b* to chap. iv. 26. The appeal to this section is required to show that the writer of it was so wedded to the term Jahveh for God that, wherever Elohim appears as a leading term in the Pentateuchal narration, such passages can be legitimately assigned to another writer, however closely intertwined they may be with the narrative of the former. In the face of this theory and confident claim, is it not startling to any man of sober critical judgment to find that the very first verse of this section completely contradicts the "single name" hypothesis so far as the Jahvist is concerned? In the very first reference which this

supposed Jahvistic writer makes to God, the name he employs is not single, but double; it is not Jahveh, but Jahveh Elohim. The writer is not simply a Jahvist; he is also an Elohist.

Not only so, but he continues consistently to use this twofold name throughout the second chapter, and as far as the end of the third, except in four instances, where, let it be well noted, he employs, not the name "Jahveh," which is supposed to distinguish his document, but the other name "Elohim."

In any seriously scientific province, an unfortunate theory so completely stultified by facts at the very outset of investigation would be immediately relegated to the limbo of exploded guesses. But, as I have already intimated, and shall repeatedly have occasion to expose, the Higher Critic prefers the unscientific method of tampering with the facts until they are squared with the theory. The Pentateuch "as it now stands" must be abolished, in order that the hypothesis of the Higher Critic may remain. Against this convenient mutilation of the actual Pentateuch I shall, in the name of sane criticism, strongly protest at every stage, and I do so most emphatically in the present instance.

The Higher Critic's method of evading the testimony of the Pentateuchal data just mentioned is that of summary excision. "Elohim" *delendus est*. But a true criticism cannot possibly allow this excision, for the simple reason that no justification can be

proved for such serious tampering with the records as they stand.

Kuenen merely affirms with airy positiveness that a certain R (Redactor) who united the two documents P and JE (the latter of which had already been stitched into a discrepant union by an earlier compiler whom Dr. Driver marks as JE), "altered Jahveh into Jahveh Elohim, thereby giving it to be understood that the Creator of man, Jahveh, in this second story, was no other than the Elohim of chap. i.-ii. 3 (Jahveh, who is Elohim)."

Dr. Driver follows his master so closely that he almost gives us a literal transcript of the above. He says, "In appending from J the narrative of Paradise he" (*i.e.* the second Compiler) "omitted probably the opening words (for the narrative begins abruptly), and to Jahveh added the defining adjunct Elohim, for the purpose of identifying expressly the author of life in Gen. ii. 4^b *ff.* with God the Creator in i. 1 *ff.*" In a footnote Dr. Driver adds, "Producing an unusual and emphatic phrase (=Jahveh, who is God)."

So far these authorities have given us nothing but their *ipse dixit* for the alleged procedure of this hypothetical Redactor. The affirmations I have quoted make no attempt to prove the necessity of such an adjunct for the alleged purpose, or to show from the rest of the Pentateuch that it was consistent with the habits of this Redactor to subject the name of the Deity to modifications on such an

important scale. Is the simple and unproven *dictum* of the Higher Critic to be meekly accepted? I, for one, must decline, and demand clear proof for every step that is taken.

To Wellhausen must be assigned the credit in this instance, that he *does* betray the consciousness that some attempted proof, even if it be conveyed merely in innuendo, should be offered in support of such a prodigious supposition. In the "Encyclopædia Britannica" he writes as follows: "The addition of Elohim, which produces the *un-Hebrew* form Jahveh Elohim in Gen. ii., iii., is due to an editor who desired to soften the abrupt transition from the Elohim of the one narrator to the Jahveh of the other."

Wellhausen's explanation of this singular conjecture is substantially different from that of Kuenen and Driver. He was probably keen enough to see that the other explanation would not stand examination. But, if so, his keenness did not extend to the point of perceiving the equal untenability of his own. The suggestion that manipulation was needed in "post-exilic times" to elucidate the relation between the two well-known names for God, Jahveh and Elohim, is in truth as puerile as can well be conceived. But, on the other hand, the suggestion that the Redactor, who is supposed to have put the present Pentateuch together, possessed any delicate scruples respecting "abrupt transitions" of any kind (and especially in regard of passing from

Jahveh to Elohim, and *vice versa*), cannot but provoke a smile of amusement. Arguing from the Redactor's method as demonstrated in the remainder of the book of Genesis (and this is obviously the correct critical criterion), we cannot avoid the conclusion that the Redactor had no sense of abruptness of transition in passing suddenly from one Divine name to another, or any care at all about "softening" such transitions, for there is no feature in the book of Genesis more obtrusive than its sudden leaps from the one to the other of these Divine names.

But Wellhausen, aware perhaps that this flimsy shaft could effect nothing, searched his quiver for another. He made the discovery that the combination Jahveh Elohim is "un-Hebrew." The point of the suggestion is obvious. That remarkable Redactor, who was capable of welding a number of Hebrew documents together so curiously, was an ignoramus in Hebrew. Of course, the original writer of J would not have used an "un-Hebrew" combination, seeing that he was probably nearly as great an authority on pure Hebrew as Wellhausen himself. So the hand of the Redactor is betrayed by the defectiveness of his education in the Hebrew tongue!

It is indeed a weak case that has to betake itself to such a refuge as this. I do not pretend to know Hebrew as Wellhausen did, but my readers will agree with me that the Old Testament is a greater authority on Hebrew words and phrases even than

Wellhausen was, and it is to that authority I confidently appeal. The designation "Elohim" is used in two characteristic ways in the Old Testament. It is employed in specific relation to certain men or things; as in the phrases—"The Elohim of Abraham, the Elohim of heaven, and the Elohim of the earth." It is also used absolutely, simply "Elohim," or "The Elohim," with a universal reference which is easily understood, and needs not to be expressed. Now, the Elohim of specific reference is joined to Jahveh in the Pentateuch with great frequency. It is such a characteristic feature that detailed quotation is unnecessary. In Gen. xxiv. we have such combinations as, "Jahveh Elohim of heaven, and, Jahveh Elohim of my lord Abraham." In Gen. xxviii. we find "Jahveh Elohim of Abraham thy father." The instances might be easily multiplied. There is not a more characteristic feature of the Hebrew Pentateuch than this combination of Jahveh Elohim, a conjunction which Wellhausen pronounces "un-Hebrew."

In this recognised combination of Jahveh Elohim, the Elohim portion is, as we have seen, freely used in various relations. Among these possible relations, the universal relation of Elohim has clearly a necessary place. No specific definition is needed to express this unlimited relation, so the combination is simply and majestically expressed by the unqualified terms "Jahveh Elohim." If Jahveh Elohim is a permissible combination at all, it is

equally permissible in all the possible references of Elohim. If it is "un-Hebrew," then the Hebrew of the Pentateuch is deplorable.

After the first beginnings of human history, it is obvious that the combination Jahveh Elohim would be frequently employed in *specific* reference, as God entered into *particular* relations with the world He sought to redeem. But the universal form, the unqualified Jahveh Elohim, is used a great number of times, with obvious appropriateness, in the second and third chapters of Genesis. In Exodus ix. 30, the absolute conjunction, Jahveh Elohim, occurs again, where, with clear and impressive fitness, the arrogant Pharaoh is reminded of the universal God. The combination in its absolute form is found also in 2 Sam. vii. 22, 25; 1 Chron. xvii. 16, 17; 2 Chron. vi. 41, 42; Ps. lxxxiv. 8, 11. The naturalness and freedom which the Hebrew writers felt in this combination is interestingly exhibited in Ps. l. 1, where it appears in the reverse order, viz. Elohim Jahveh. Yet, because this combination in Gen. ii. iii. is fatal to his "single name" hypothesis, Wellhausen dismisses it on the pretext that it is "un-Hebrew"! Let my readers judge.

But, perhaps, the modern Higher Critic is disposed to lean upon the "elucidation" conjecture of Kuenen and Driver rather than upon Wellhausen's transparently insubstantial innuendo. I have already in anticipation indicated the puerility of the former.

According to the Higher Critic, the document P (that of the priestly Elohist) is a post-exilic production. It was, of course, later still that the "Redactor" joined this document into a patchwork unity with the other patchwork combination which is labelled JE. It must be distinctly noted that Drs. Kuenen and Driver and their fellow-critics hold that Gen. i.-ii. 4*a* and Gen. ii. 4*b*-iv. 26 belonged to entirely distinct and independent documents until a late post-exilic period. That is, their combination is postponed to a date when the interchangeable names for the Deity must have been long as familiar to all the people as their own names. Yet Dr. Driver conjectures that at such a time as this, the Redactor, when he joined these chapters together, deemed it necessary to tamper with the name of the Deity in the second portion, "for the purpose of expressly identifying the Author of life in Gen. ii. 4*b* *ff.* with God the Creator in Gen. i. 1 *ff.*" I put it to the serious judgment of my readers whether anything more improbable can well be conceived.

Clearly, the "elucidation" conjecture collapses at the first touch, but there are certain critical ends which I wish to gain by elaborating its destruction, and I must ask those readers who are already sufficiently conscious of its annihilation, to forgive me for briefly belabouring this now defunct body. Now, even if it were not ludicrous to suppose that such "identification" would be

even dreamt of as necessary at such a period, the features of the chapters themselves are altogether inconsistent with the supposed design. If identification were needed, it was obviously not necessary to go on monotonously and uselessly repeating the explanation through the whole of the second and third chapters of Genesis. If the Redactor had any literary sense, or indeed any sense at all, he would have introduced his explanation once for all at the first occurrence of the name Jahveh. When this name first appeared, he would have added some such identification as, "who is also Elohim," and so, the identification having been accomplished, the narrative would pursue its natural course. But what can you think of a Redactor who thought it necessary to repeat twenty times in immediate succession, within the space of two chapters, the simple explanation that Jahveh and Elohim were one and the same? I, for one, should certainly think that he needed the watchful attention of his friends. Yet the combination Jahveh Elohim occurs a score of times in the second and third chapters of Genesis.

Further, if identification were really needed, the arrangement of the Divine names in Gen. ii., iii., iv. would only make confusion worse confounded. What principle of elucidation can be conceived in carrying the explanatory Jahveh Elohim through two-thirds of the opening Jahveh section, and then abruptly dropping it in favour of the simple Jahveh?

Why was the term Jahveh Elohim carried exactly to the point of the expulsion from Paradise, and no further? To these pertinent and important questions the "elucidation" hypothesis can give no manner of reply.

In fact, the arrangement of these chapters is ill-calculated to furnish any formal identification of the different Divine names, for in this so-called Jahveh section these names are used with remarkable freedom and promiscuity. Within the brief limits of these three chapters the Deity is designated by name thirty-four times. The leading term in this section, viz. Jahveh Elohim, occurs twenty times, Elohim five times, and Jahveh nine times. Can it be called "criticism" of any sort which persists in maintaining the "single name" theory in the face of facts which clearly refute it at the very outset of the investigation?

A still closer examination of this section even more strongly accentuates the hopelessness of the theory of the Higher Critics, and the necessity of discerning in the Pentateuch an intelligent and discriminative use of the variant Divine names. For the employment of the term Jahveh Elohim in this section as far as the expulsion from Eden, and its abrupt cessation at that point, the "single name" theory cannot show even the semblance of an explanation. I shall demonstrate later how perfectly this feature suits the natural principle of discriminative intelligence in the use of these great words.

When we perceive that Satan is made to use the name Elohim, instead of Jahveh Elohim, the dullest sense can discern a psychological implication. But the most startling discrimination is found between the 1st and 25th verses of the fourth chapter. The "single name" theory cannot possibly give any reason why Eve should have used the name Jahveh in the former verse in relation to Cain, and the name Elohim in the latter verse in reference to Seth. In fact, that theory is flatly contradicted by the equal introduction of these two leading terms in these co-ordinate passages. The difference must of necessity be one of definite discrimination; yet the circumstances are so closely parallel that the discrimination is obviously of a most subtle and delicate kind.

This is a suitable point at which to interject an anticipatory paragraph. The psychological interpretation of the Divine names in the Pentateuch is, as I have demonstrated, absolutely forced upon us by the opening chapters in Genesis. The so-called "critical" theory collapses when confronted by the actual features of this section, and desperately tries to save itself by the inadmissible expedient of tampering with the actual document. It is compelled to excise Elohim twenty times out of the second and third chapters, and to alter Eve's Elohim in chapter iv. 25 into Jahveh. It must perpetrate this mutilation, or perish. By some curious partiality, however, it allows Satan to be a psychologist.

The mutilation was, in truth, already sufficient to stagger even a Higher Critic, and so, by a dexterous concession, Satan's "Elohim" is permitted to remain. The only alternative to this wholesale maiming of the document is a candid recognition of the psychological interpretation to which it compels us. The psychological meanings which are forced upon us here will be abundantly confirmed and illustrated as we proceed; but we have already seen the psychological subtlety of the Oriental mind in this opening section in the delicate discrimination which Eve made in the respective cases of her two sons, Cain and Seth. The Higher Critics have made a very confident point in affirming that all attempts to explain the psychological use of the Divine names in detail in the Pentateuch have been unsuccessful. This vaunt has no value. It was probable *a priori* that the psychological movements of the Oriental mind in an ancient Oriental document would be frequently difficult to follow, and contain subtleties of discrimination which would evade our search. It is a grave defect of the Higher Criticism that it insists upon subjecting this antique book to the test of modern literary canons and criteria, instead of allowing it to be its own authority on its own methods. In an old work like this, so complex and wonderful, many details may have to be left unexplained for the present. It is sufficient if we can demonstrate that the main scheme and outlines of the book are consistent with, and illuminated

by, a determinate and consistently discriminative employment of the names for God which are so conspicuously variant. I am confident that I can demonstrate this to the hilt, with the important addition that this conception is alone consistent with the many features presented by the Pentateuch. But is it not strange that the critics should make an ado about these alleged difficulties in relation to details when, as I have shown, their own theory sustains, not difficulties of detail, but complete and absolute contradiction, as soon as it is confronted with the actual features even of the first four chapters in Genesis? The "single name" Jahveh document has unmistakably vanished at the first touch of exact and sincere criticism.

We now turn our attention to the Elohist document (E), which the Higher Critics declare can be demonstrated to have existed as a separate and self-contained composition from which the name Jahveh is rigidly excluded. This is the writer who is supposed to have announced in Exodus iii. 14, 15 the *very first* communication of the Divine name Jahveh, and therefore (to quote Kuenen's own words concerning this writer and the other Elohist (P)) they "could not represent either God Himself in the pre-Mosaic times, or the people who were then living, as using this name; and in all probability they would themselves avoid it in the narratives that referred to this earlier period . . . as a matter of fact, *the texts themselves show that they use Elohim throughout.*"

It was impossible to resist the temptation of italicising that last sentence, which for audacity of misrepresentation could not well be surpassed. Let us examine the texts in a few crucial instances, beginning with that very section in which the first communication of the name Jahveh is supposed to have been made. According to Kuenen himself, "in Exod. iii. 1-15, E is quite unmistakable." Let any one now turn to this E section, and marvel at the utter recklessness of this Higher Critic. The name Jahveh is not communicated until the 14th verse, and, according to Kuenen, "*the texts themselves* show that this writer uses Elohim throughout" until that communication is made. Yet in the 2nd verse the writer uses the phrase "the angel of Jahveh"; in the 4th verse we find, "And when Jahveh saw"; in the 7th verse we come upon, "And Jahveh said." That is, in the former part of the very chapter on which Kuenen bases his theory, the *texts themselves* show that his theory is false. The manner in which the Higher Critic attempts to evade this crushing confutation shall receive our attention a little later.

Let us take another crucial example. In Dr. Driver's "Introduction" we find Gen. xxii. 1-14 assigned to this E document. Let my readers remember Kuenen's deliberate affirmation, and restrain their amazement, if they can. In the 2nd verse we find the name "Moriah," which is a compound containing Jah, the shortened form of Jahveh.

In the 11th verse the "angel of Jahveh" occurs. And in the 14th verse Jahveh appears twice, in the appellation "Jahveh Jireh," and in the words "the mount of Jahveh." I must also point out that this same narrative is continued with the most perfect homogeneity and sequence as far as the 18th verse. I do not believe that any one without a preconceived theory could ever doubt that the whole belongs to one original composition. And in this remaining portion of the same narrative the name Jahveh twice appears. But Dr. Driver and his friends violently tear this latter portion from its organic union with the former part and assign it, for no substantial reason except the demands of the "single name" hypothesis, to that imaginary Jahveh document, which we found to vanish under critical examination.

In Gen. xx. a very interesting case arises in the employment of the name Jahveh by the supposed Elohist. This chapter contains a complete narrative concerning Abraham and Sarah and Abimelech. It must clearly be assigned by the Higher Critics to the writer E, for Elohim is the name by which it names the Deity. But suddenly, after the exclusive use of Elohim through seventeen verses, the narrative, as if for the express confutation of this vain Elohistic conjecture, comes to a striking end with a truly expressive use of the name Jahveh.

Already our proofs have been ample from the

texts themselves to show that this supposed Elohist did *not* "use Elohim throughout," and that he was also a Jahvist when his thought required the employment of the name Jahveh. It would be superfluous to pursue all the instances which might be adduced to the same purpose, but we will single out one other conspicuous example to crown the present list. Gen. xxviii. 10-22 narrates the vision of Jacob at Bethel. This narrative is strongly and pervadingly Elohistic. The name Elohim is employed once in the 12th verse, twice in the 13th verse, once in the 17th verse, once in the 20th verse, and twice in the 22nd verse. But do the *texts themselves* in this narrative "show that the writer uses Elohim throughout"? On the contrary, they show in this case, as they do elsewhere, that the writer who employed the name Elohim was accustomed to use Jahveh also along with it in the same continuous and homogeneous narrative. In this "Elohistic" story of Jacob's vision, Jahveh is found twice in the 13th verse, once in the 16th verse, and once in the 21st verse. In this last instance Jacob himself is represented as acquainted with the name Jahveh, and using it.

By what expedients do the Higher Critics attempt to elude the clear consequences of such an array of facts so directly subversive of their theory? Kuenen says concerning the occurrence of the name Jahveh in the earlier verses of Exodus iii.: "To this narrative—in which Jahveh could not possibly be used

before vv. 14, 15—another account is now welded (*or detached verses added*) in which that name occurs." That is to say, the facts of the Pentateuch must once more be juggled with in order to fit into the critics' theory. That hypothetical Jahveh Compiler, whose unimaginable freaks of eccentricity I have described in an earlier passage, is again summoned from the vasty deep to save the situation. A strange sort of creature this; and he grows stranger and stranger! And what is Kuenen's reason for invoking this fantastical being? There is a naïve clause in his own words which furnishes the answer; it is simply because his theory demands the deletion of these Jahvehs from the original document. According to his theory, "Jahveh could not possibly be used before vv. 14, 15"; therefore, for that reason, and for no other reason in the wide world, the Jahvehs that are actually and undoubtedly found before that verse in that same narrative must be removed. The theory triumphs over a mangled Pentateuch. I have before pointed out, and must insist again, that such a process is critically inadmissible. The theory must fall before the facts.¹

The defence of the Theory is equally uncritical and futile in Gen. xxii. Dr. Driver appears, in his

¹ It is clear that the assignment of these passages to the Jahveh Document is not more justifiable than their ascription to the Jahvistic Compiler.

"Introduction," to concede verses 1-14 to the Elohist writer, and I cannot find that he attempts to give any explanation of the Jahvehs that appear in that section. But I presume that this must be an oversight, for he definitely maintains the same theory of the Elohist as Kuenen does, and cannot therefore admit the presence of Jahveh in the original Elohist document. In fact, he cannot admit it without confessing that the fundamental conception of his critical theory is erroneous. So I have no doubt that he finds himself obliged to take refuge with Kuenen in once more conjuring the mysterious Jahveh Compiler, who, being nothing but a thing of airy and arbitrary conjecture, can always take the blame for inserting Jahvehs where they are not wanted by the critics. Of course the removal of the embarrassing Jahvehs by this arbitrary *tour de force* is not a critical process at all, nor can it produce any results that can be seriously accepted by any man of sober and balanced judgment. It simply means that the Pentateuch has to be altered to suit the theory, and, since this must be done, one *deus ex machina* will serve the turn as well as another. Dr. Driver, in defiance of the continuity of the narrative, assigns verses 15-18 to the Jahveh document. But Kuenen, with greater adroitness, saves the continuity and gets rid of all the Jahvehs at the same time, by making a more elaborate use of this happily imagined Compiler. Since this incalculable sprite could always be kept at hand to

sponge out all objectionable and awkward words from the Pentateuch "*as it now stands*," it was well to extend its valuable services as far as possible. Let Kuenen, therefore, give us his extravagant guesses to his heart's content, but he must not expect us to call them criticism. This is how he loosely rambles on: "Gen. xxii. 15-18 is incorporated" (*i.e.* by the Jahveh Compiler) "into a story of E's. But he did not confine himself to this expansion. He has likewise been busy with verses 11 and 14." My readers will take note that those are the verses in which Jahveh is found. Kuenen continues: "And Wellhausen . . . and others rightly judge that he substituted Moriah in verse 2 for the name of some place in Ephraim, with the express purpose of transplanting Abraham's deed of faith to Jerusalem." Can we be seriously asked to regard all these wild and utterly unprovable conjectures as valid criticism? Is it not time to demand that the criticism of the Pentateuch shall have some regard to facts, and deal soberly and cautiously with the prolific suggestions of speculation and conjecture? The hand of the Jahvist Compiler would not have been dreamt of in the above passages if the plain features of the text had not contradicted the theory of the Higher Critic. Therefore his intrusion is critically inadmissible. The theory fails before the actual Pentateuch, and it must not mutilate the document which is its judge.

We shall gain nothing by pursuing the Higher

Critic with the other Elohistie passages in which we found the name Jahveh also employed. For he has no other defence than the entirely conjectural operations of this imaginary Compiler. No arguments can deal with this creature of phantasy, for an arbitrary device of this kind is outside the pale of reasoning and of criticism. According to Kuenen, it was this hypothetical being that wrought all the Jahvehs which occur in the Elohistie account of Jacob's vision, and, of course, in all other cases where the presence of this Divine name contradicts the critics' theory. Perhaps this wild hypothesis reaches the climax of extravagance when it encounters the name Jahveh in Gen. xxviii. 21. This Jahveh is deeply imbedded in an Elohistie passage, being preceded by two Elohims and immediately followed by two Elohims. Not the wildest imagination can conceive why or on what principle that Jahveh was imbedded there, unless it was in the original Elohistie document. It cannot be deleted except by intolerable violence, for its place is fixed by the highest critical probability. And, strikingly enough, in this most impregnable case, the name Jahveh is put into the mouth of one of the patriarchs, who are supposed by the critical theory to have been altogether unacquainted with it. Such is the disastrous fate of the theory when confronted by the facts. We demonstrated before that the Jahvist was also an Elohist. We have

now given ample and complete proof that the Elohist was also a Jahvist.

Two of the "single name" documents have vanished under inspection and criticism. The third now claims our attention. This is generally called P, because the critical theory ascribes its composition to the priesthood. But I am concerned at present only with the hypothesis that this also is a "single name" Elohist document, the writer of which believed that the name Jahveh was not known to the patriarchs, or to Israel before the days of Moses, and therefore employed the name Elohim exclusively up to that date. If there was a writer with such a belief and such a practice, it is, of course, obvious that his work was originally separate and independent from that of the writer or writers who were free to make use of the name Jahveh.

The conclusions we have already demonstrated have conducted us to a most interesting critical situation which it will be helpful to set in definite and clear relief at this point before we proceed to inspect the remaining fragment, the P section, of the Genesis narrative. We have proved from the actual contents of the Pentateuch that the employment of the names Jahveh and Elohim cannot be assigned, in the greater portion of the Genesis narration, to "single name" writers; for we have seen that Elohims and Jahvehs are easily and plentifully discoverable in organic union both in the

Elohistic and in the Jahvistic section. We have also already had it forced upon us as a scarcely resistible conclusion that these names are used with discrimination, and accord with varying psychological standpoints in the organising mind of the writer. This having been demonstrated in respect of by far the greater portion of the Pentateuch in which the striking alternations of the names Jahveh and Elohim appear, it is just criticism to point out that any plausibility which may have attached to the "single name" hypothesis has already been seriously, if not completely, discredited, and that it is *a priori* highly probable that the employment of the Divine name in the remaining fragment of these complex writings is determined by the same fruitful principle.

It is critically important to note that there is no controversy respecting the fact that the Pentateuch is a strikingly complex production. It is this undoubted complexity which has been hastily mistaken by the Higher Critics for separateness and independency. The discriminative use of the Divine names, in such an elaborate system as the Pentateuch exhibits, not only allows, but compels, the conception of a document combining within its unity a varied complex of widely diverse stand-points. It will reflect the significant diversity as well as the profound unity of the Divine names.

The bearing of these principles upon the possible

features of the P fragment which we have yet to examine is plain. In a complex document such as I have described, it would not be at all surprising if, by making the criterion of selection sufficiently limited, a slice could be ingeniously detached which should reflect only the Elohistie standpoint of the writer's thought. That a piece broken off from Genesis by certain arbitrarily chosen marks should contain only one of the Divine names would, as a matter of rigid criticism, prove nothing; for that might be amply explained on the basis of psychological diversity of standpoint. Of course, the case would be altered if the Higher Critics could do what they have pretended to do, namely, demonstrate that the alternations of Jahveh and Elohim *throughout the whole of Genesis* are consistent with the assumption of independent "single name" writers. But, as this assumption has been completely exploded for the greater part of the contents of the book, the critical aspect of the case for the narrow margin that remains is entirely altered.

The marks by which P is torn from the complex structure to which it belongs are such as might well have secured a fragment with an exclusively Elohistie colouring. These marks we shall deal with later in greater detail. For the present it will suffice to say that certain precise and formal expressions, and a certain technicality and formality of narrative, constitute the rigid criteria by which this

"document" is determined. Any portion of the Genesis narrative which is not cast in this "formal" mould is straightway assigned to another "document." I repeat that it would not be at all surprising if a mere fragment of Genesis, selected on such artificial lines, were found to contain only one of the names employed for God. Such arbitrary detachment of a single fragment from the whole serves no critical end.

But, on the other hand, if even such a narrow and formal selection of a fragment (a selection obviously confined to one limited standpoint, and therefore likely to be psychologically attached to one only of the Divine names) is still found to contain any trace, however slight, of the other great Divine name which is prominent in the book, the "single name" theory obviously collapses in complete and final annihilation.

We are now prepared to estimate with a just critical judgment the testimony, if any, of the section P to the "single name" theory. Gen. v. is assigned to this "document." In verse 30 we find the words, "Because of the ground which Jahveh hath cursed." As before, the Higher Critic shall give his defence presently. Gen. xvii. is assigned to the P document; yet in the very first verse we find the name Jahveh: "Jahveh appeared to Abraham." It is admitted by all the Higher Critics that Gen. xxi. 1b must be reckoned as P; yet the words are: "And Jahveh did unto Sarah as He had spoken."

Now, as I have pointed out, the importance of the discovery of the name Jahveh in this section is but slightly affected by its frequency or infrequency. The conditions of the selection are such that a single appearance of the name is virtually as effectual as if it were repeated a thousand times. But, it may be well to point out that the appearance of the name of God *in any form* is comparatively infrequent in the fragment P. A good portion of it consists of bare genealogies, in which God is scarcely mentioned, or not at all. In chap. xxiii. also, which records the formal transaction of the purchase of the Macpelah burying-place, the Deity is not mentioned. In such a document, selected by such a process, the appearance of two or three Jahvehs assumes considerable importance, and inflicts the final *coup de grace* on the "single name" hypothesis.

What is the answer of the Higher Critic to these facts? After all, his ingenuity is limited, for he has but the old expedient, namely, deletion. The Pentateuch "as it now stands" must be corrected and revised. The Critics have assigned the "Redactors" to a wrong date; it is *now* the "Redactors" are busy at their work. The Jahveh in Gen. v. is assigned to a hypothetical Jahvistic genealogical table which the "Redactor" or "Compiler" threw away after extracting from it two or three sentences. The evidence which reduces this hypothetical personage to "airy nothing" will, of

course, be involved in the demonstration of the organic unity of the Pentateuchal composition, so we will let the expedient pass for the present.

On the presence of Jahveh in Gen. xvii. and xxi., let Dr. Driver's apology be given in his own words: "Twice in P the name Jahveh appears in place of the name God (Elohim); and the variation, it has been argued, is subversive of the grounds upon which the critical analysis of Genesis rests. But this argument attaches undue significance to an *isolated* phenomenon. We must weigh the alternatives, and ask which is the more probable; that an inference, dependent upon an *abundance* of criteria, extending throughout the entire Pentateuch, should be a mistaken one, or that the Compiler, or even a scribe, should *twice* have substituted the more usual Jahveh for Elohim under the influence of the usage of the verses preceding."

The foregoing passage will seem very strange reading to those who have followed my demonstrations in the present chapter, and have seen the "single name" theory hopelessly overwhelmed by facts which the Pentateuch "abundantly" presented. Dr. Driver is clearly not unaware of the value of innuendo, but his suggestion respecting the "more usual Jahveh" is a very feeble contribution. He surely cannot seriously mean to suggest that the employment of Elohim in Genesis is so subordinate as to account for any change of Elohim into Jahveh. Taking the sections P and E together, the name Elohim is used

so frequently and prominently (especially in chaps. i.-xxi.) that the idea of such a predominating influence of the name Jahveh upon the mind of Compiler or Scribe cannot be reasonably entertained. The whole of Gen. i. and Gen. ii. 1-3 employs the name Elohim. In Gen. iii. Elohim is found four times. In chap. v. only Elohim is found, with one exception. From chap. vi. 9 to chap. ix. 17 Elohim is (with but five exceptions) exclusively used. In Gen. x. the Divine name (Jahveh) occurs but once. In Gen. xi. 10-32 neither Elohim nor Jahveh occurs. In chaps. xii. and xiii. Jahveh is employed. In chap. xiv. there is neither Elohim nor Jahveh. In chaps. xv. and xvi. Jahveh occurs, and in chap. xvii. Elohim (with one exception) is found in the text. The balance is clearly much too even for such a suggestion as Dr. Driver offers. The alternations of Jahveh and Elohim are a prominent feature of Genesis, and both Compiler and Scribe would be fully alive to the fact.

The same reasoning strongly rebuts the more pointed suggestion that these two particular Jahvehs were introduced by a scribe under the influence of a Jahveh *immediately preceding*. Chap. xxi. 1a contains the name Jahveh, and it is suggested that the scribe, under the influence of that word, wrote it again instead of Elohim in the following clause. Of course, the sequence of the clauses lends a considerable amount of plausibility to the conjecture. But the application of the same explanation to the Jahveh in chap. xvii. 1, is much less plausible. It is true

that the name used for God in chap. xvi. is Jahveh ; but it is by no means an uncommon thing in Genesis for an Elohim section to follow abruptly upon a Jahveh section. Besides, the last name for God employed in chap. xvi. is not Jahveh, but El. These letters, being the beginning of Elohim, would lead the next thought of the scribe to Elohim rather than to Jahveh. And this influence would be strengthened by the feature that chap. xvii. employs Elohim throughout.

In the latter case, then, the supposed alteration is, critically considered, highly improbable. And even in the former case, when the structure of the book and the characteristic alternations of Elohim and Jahveh are considered, it may be taken for granted that the scribe, who could not fail to be arrested by these features, would be constantly on his guard against making a mistake in transcribing the Divine names. The same reasoning obviously applies to the operations of the Compiler. In fine, there are many subtle evidences in the book of the minute exactitude with which the variant Divine names have been transcribed and preserved.

No one who has read the foregoing pages will entertain Dr. Driver's suggestion that there is an "*abundance of criteria*" establishing the "single name" theory which may legitimately over-ride in this instance the actual text of the Pentateuch. The reply to his question is simply this: "If a fragment be detached by artificial phraseological criteria from

the complex whole of the Pentateuch, there is no critical necessity that it should, or should not, contain the name Jahveh, nor is there any law to determine how often it shall appear, whether it be a score of times, or twice, or thrice." Obviously enough, the only necessity for the removal of these Jahvehs is the necessity of saving the "single name" theory from destruction. And once more, in the name of true criticism, I must protest against the manipulation of facts for the sole object of safeguarding a tottering theory. I close this chapter by once more quoting with amazement Kuenen's affirmation: "As a matter of fact the *texts themselves* show that they" (*i.e.* E and P) "use Elohim throughout"!!!

VI

THE LITERARY STYLE OF JE AND P

ADHERING to the just critical method of taking the actual contents of the Pentateuch as our guide, we have seen that those contents distinctly refuse to separate themselves into the "single name" documents J, E, and P. We have found Jahveh and Elohim so plentifully intermingled in the J and E sections that it is only with amazement one can contemplate the confidence with which critics have written of their separability. With respect to the P section, it would not, as I have before observed, have been at all surprising if, after cutting out from Genesis such a large section as the JE portion, the fragment which remained might be found stripped of the name Jahveh. For, according to any theory whatsoever, there must be portions of Genesis in which the one name or the other will not be found. But even the small consolation of such a residual fragment is denied to the Higher Critic. After the most painstaking labours on his part to remove all the Jahvehs into another "document," the remaining fragment P insists upon retaining two Jahvehs as vivid marks of its vital membership in the organic whole of the

book of Genesis, just as the most carefully excised fragment of a many-coloured weft would be likely to retain some threads indicative of its origin. When the branch is torn off from the tree, the Jahveh fibres are still found clinging to it. This suggestive fact ought to have made the Higher Critic pause.

It is but just to admit that the Compilation Theory does not rest exclusively upon the phenomena of the employment of variant Divine names in the Pentateuch. Kuenen himself was evidently aware that this afforded but doubtful ground. For he says in his "Hexateuch": "The history of critical investigation has shown that far too much weight has often been laid on agreement in the use of the Divine names—so much so that it has twice led the critics wrong." Some of Kuenen's naïve admissions are exceedingly interesting. So the critics can get wrong, after all! And they can be led wrong through false inferences concerning the use of the Divine name! But it was, of course, the older Higher Critics that were capable of being led astray: Kuenen and his disciples are infallible!

Next to the striking disposition of the names for God in the book of Genesis, the feature which has been most effectively exploited on behalf of the Compilation Theory is the marked difference between the sections P and JE in style, phraseology, and diction. Before proceeding to this further examination, however, it is needful to observe that the phenomena of the Divine names have been the

prime factor in inducing belief in independent "documents." These phenomena are the most obvious, and easily impress the unwary mind with the idea of variant authorship. It is scarcely too much to say that, if this surface feature had been absent, the modern critical theory would never have been born. To say the least, our demonstration of the untenability of the "single name" theory has overturned half the foundations of the Compilation Hypothesis. The ease and completeness with which this has been done may be taken as a foretoken of the similar collapse of the remainder. For, though the impression created by the variant styles of JE and P has captured many minds, it has not been greater than that produced by the variant names for the Deity, and, when it is subjected to rigid critical scrutiny, will no more support the Compilation Theory than the latter feature has done.

The argument from divergence of style has been presented in a one-sided manner which must be corrected by balanced and comprehensive criticism. It is, perhaps, legitimate, as far as it goes, to choose a list of words and phrases from JE, and another list as dissimilar as possible from P, and arrange them in an imposing and impressive catalogue of contrasts to catch the eye with differences. But to do this only, or mainly, is not critical method. Exact criticism demands that these differences shall be carefully examined, in

order to ascertain whether there is underneath the surface a deeper principle of unity and harmony. It demands, further, that the similar expressions in P and JE shall be catalogued with the same fidelity as the dissimilar ones, so that the significance of literary variations in this book may be considered with critical comprehensiveness. For the same purpose, it is equally necessary to catalogue any dissimilarities which may be found within JE itself, or within P itself, so as to compare them with the variations between P and JE. If criticism is not complete, it is exceedingly mischievous.

The Higher Critics have devoted themselves mainly to the task of discovering differences between JE and P. We will endeavour to widen this investigation in the direction which we have indicated, and confidently expect to be able to demonstrate satisfactorily to our readers that the "style" features of JE and P do not prove "independent documents," but rather evidence organic unity. The arguments from alleged discrepancies, and the like, will be dealt with in a later chapter.

The first requirement of our investigation at this point is to determine in what respect and manner the style and diction of P differ from those of JE. I cannot do greater justice to the Higher Criticism than by allowing Dr. Driver himself to answer that question in his own words, for he cannot possibly be suspected of giving a

forced representation of the facts in a direction unfavourable to his own case. He writes as follows:—

“The literary style of P is strongly marked. If JE—and especially J—be free, flowing, and picturesque, P is stereotyped, measured, and prosaic. The narrative, both as a whole and in its several parts, is articulated systematically; the beginning and close of an enumeration are regularly marked by *stated formulæ*. The descriptions of P are methodical and precise. When they embrace details, emphasis and completeness are studied; hence a thought is often repeated in slightly different words. There is a tendency to describe an object *in full* each time that it is mentioned; a direction is followed, as a rule, by an account of its execution, usually *in the same words*. . . . Metaphors, similes, etc., are eschewed (Num. xxvii. 17*b* is an exception), and there is generally an absence of the poetical or dramatic element, which is frequently conspicuous in the other historical books of the O.T. (including J and E). To a greater degree than in any other part of the O.T. is a preference shown in P for *standing formulæ and expressions*. . . . It seems as though the habits of thought and expression which the author had contracted through his practical acquaintance with the law were carried by him into his treatment of purely historical subjects.”

Now, what does the preceding description of P's style amount to? It is precisely the sort of writing

which one would naturally expect to find in any document of a legal, technical, or formal character, such as, charters, treaties, formal records and ordinances, and the like; and, being a thoroughly artificial style of writing, it would be the last to be adopted by any capable writer as his normal "style," and would be reserved by him for the composition of studiously formal passages. Just as if some English historian, for example, were to insert in his narrative at suitable intervals certain illustrative charters, transactions, and enactments, distinctively drawn up by him in the formal phraseology suitable to such documents. Such strongly marked formal methods of expression have been employed from time immemorial by writers of every style in cases like the foregoing, so that it is not, strictly speaking, a variation of style at all, but only of manner. It is the temporary surrender of the writer's normal style to the requirements of a conventional model.

The conventional character of what is called the distinctive style of P is so obvious that even Dr. Driver is compelled to make the following concession:—

"Were these expressions *confined* to the legal section, it might be argued that they were the work of the same hand as JE, who, with a change of subject, adopted *naturally* an altered phraseology; but they are found repeatedly in the *narrative* parts of the Hexateuch, where the *peculiar* phraseology

cannot be attributed to the special character of the subject." This last phrase is, of course, a bare and unproven affirmation, and we need not deal with it at the present moment. The point of critical value in the paragraph is the admission that the general character of P's literary *peculiarity* is such as can be reasonably explained by such technical and conventional forms as a writer would *naturally* employ in drawing up a legal document. The admission that P's characteristic variations are all cast in this conventional mould is fatal to the attempt to invest them with literary significance and to make them the proofs of an "independent" document. Why should such studiously formal phraseology be confined to legal enactments? Even if it were only in legal enactments that such formal phraseology were adopted in the present day, it does not follow that the same limitation of range prevailed in the days of Moses, or at any other time when the Pentateuch may be supposed to have been written. It is not true criticism to judge an ancient document offhand by modern criteria. Why may not this ancient writer have seen fit to present certain general and formal aspects of historical transactions, as well as general ordinances, in this same prominently formal phraseology? Are there not charters and treaties and formal covenants in all history, in which historical narrative is imbedded in stereotyped expressions and formal phrases? Dr. Driver's limitation is too arbitrary. It appears to me critically obvious

that the adoption of formal phraseology for formal purposes is no evidence of diversity of authorship. The Higher Criticism supposes that P wrote a whole history in nothing but legal phraseology. This is as remarkable as some of the exploits of the "Redactors," for it is safe to say that P is the only writer in the history of literature that has attempted such a weary task. But if, as seems even *prima facie* a good deal more probable, the so-called P sections are but designedly formal sections of a larger whole, sanity and proportion are preserved, and the complete history becomes intelligible as a psychological and literary product. It is unnecessary for me to catalogue the formal phrases of P. Any one who cares to consult the miscellaneous list given in Dr. Driver's "Introduction" will find that they all wear that technical and precise, yet generalising, complexion which is peculiar to the conventional phraseology of formal documents.

This view is confirmed by the fact that this particular kind of variation exactly corresponds with the variation implied in the psychological discrimination of the Divine names Jahveh and Elohim. The presence of such discrimination would be quite sufficient to account for considerable diversity of standpoint and style, so that the mere demonstrations of differences which the Higher Critics so generously parade do not *ipso facto* prove any particular theory. If they can be shown to correspond with the suggestive variety of the Divine names, they will

also partake of the essential unity of these related conceptions of God. Elohim is the *general* name for God. It has no special significance, but denotes the general and universal ground of Deity out of which all special revelations must be particularly evolved. Jahveh, on the other hand, connotes a *particular* self-revelation of God through a chosen line. In the Pentateuch this revelation is, however, represented as partial and gradual during the earlier history, not attaining its completion until the beginning of Israel's career as a nation under the hand of Moses. In the record of Genesis it therefore represents an *ideal* towards which men set their hearts, and not a formally concluded revelation. As to His name Jahveh, the knowledge of God was not attained by the patriarchs; they saw the glory of it afar off.

With such a suggestive framework as the foregoing through which to work out his conception of history, the diversity may be naturally conceived to have been developed on the following lines by the sacred historian. One distinct current of history would represent the gradual unfolding of the knowledge of Jahveh, and would naturally picture the more vivid and idealistic relations of men to God. But, as this particular knowledge was only in the making, it would necessarily be intimately entwined with the more general or Elohist idea of God. Now, it is remarkable, to say the least, that the so-called JE document answers to these conditions most accurately and completely.

The psychological interpretation of Elohim suggests yet another standpoint. For the writer would require expression for the still more general and universal aspects of history, for the formal and complete as distinguished from the idealistic and incomplete; and this, as we have seen, would appropriately attach itself to the conception of God as Elohim. This is precisely the function which is performed by the section P, as has been made clear even by Dr. Driver's description of it. The standpoint and style of P, therefore, no less than those of JE, precisely agree with the variation required by the psychological interpretation of the Divine names. It is not at all strange that the adoption of a distinctively formal standpoint should have been associated with the employment of studiedly formal phraseology. If this variation was not originally related to the diversity of import embraced by the Divine names, it is inexplicable that it should happen to correspond so completely with that diversity.

Having demonstrated that the phraseological peculiarities of P are precisely those that are consistent with the psychological unity of the book of Genesis, I will now press the proof of this unity into the province of *similarities*, and show the remarkable points of contact between the sections JE and P. If, when JE happens to trench upon the formal standpoint, it inclines to adopt the formal phraseology of P; and if, when P impinges upon the freer ranges of JE, its phraseology begins to take the tone and colour of

the latter; then I believe I may justly maintain that the "style" features brought to light are quite inconsistent with the theory of "independent documents," and contribute to the sum of the evidence in favour of the organic unity of the book.

Let me first show that the formal hand of P appears also in JE when this section moves into formal ground.

The words, "These are the generations of, etc.," constitute one of those formal phrases claimed by the Higher Critics to be distinctive of P. Now, if the whole of Genesis be by the same hand, we shall expect this phrase, which is employed as a technical framework for the main divisions of the entire history, to be associated with parts of JE as well as of P; and this turns out precisely according to expectation. This formal phrase is found so completely imbedded in a JE section that not all the violent attempts which the Higher Critics have made to dislodge it have achieved success, or can ever do so. Yet, until they can accomplish the rupture, all the argument based upon P's peculiarities of style is subverted. As if designedly to deal the Compilation Theory a fatal blow at the very commencement of investigation, the first example of this formal phrase is found, not in P, to whom the Higher Critics maintain it exclusively belongs, but in JE. It makes its first appearance organically inwoven in the JE section in Gen. ii. 4. Dr. Driver cannot, of course, allow the words "These are the genera-

tions of the heavens and the earth" to be assigned to the JE narrative with which they are entwined in the text. Such an admission would involve the collapse of his whole theory. We will examine his method of dealing with this difficulty.

He writes: "The formula is here applied *metaphorically* to 'heaven and earth.' . . . By analogy it will introduce an account of heaven and earth, and of that which sprang from either, or could be regarded as its progeny. This agrees with what is narrated in chap. i., but not with what *follows* in chap. ii. 4*b* ff. (for the narrative here is silent respecting the *heavens*, the subject being the formation of man, and the preparation of the earth to receive him). The formula must here, therefore, *contrary to usual custom*, refer to *what precedes*. It is a plausible conjecture that originally it stood as the superscription to chap. i. 1."

This brief paragraph bristles with illegitimate assumptions and misleading suggestions, and sets in useful relief certain of the methods of the Higher Criticism. The phrase, "These are the generations of, etc." occurs with sufficient frequency in the Pentateuch to enable us to determine its force with critical exactness. It invariably has both a retrospective and a prospective reference, and introduces some "generator" of whom some account has previously been given. When we find the phrase, "These are the generations of Noah," for example, we may be certain that the words refer to a person already known and described. There-

fore the "plausible conjecture" that the words of Gen. ii. 4 were originally the superscription to chap. i. 1 is critically inadmissible. Further, the word "Toldoth" (generations) refers without exception to *human* progeny, and to such progeny clearly named and discriminated. Dr. Driver's affirmation that the formula is in this one instance *metaphorically* applied is arbitrary, having no critical basis. The employment of the idea of "generating" in a metaphorical way, so as to make it apply to the generation of material products, is a modern idea of which the Pentateuch knows nothing. This is another of the numerous cases in which the Higher Critics unwarrantably hang modern notions upon an ancient book. The actual position of this formal phrase in the second chapter is, therefore, critically confirmed, for the distinctly discriminated human progeny which the phrase everywhere requires does not appear until the narrative of the second chapter. Dr. Driver admits that the usual reference of the phrase is to what follows, and not to what precedes. The rule is, in fact, invariable, and is clearly observed in the example with which we are now engaged. Dr. Driver's assertion that it "ought to introduce an account of heaven and earth" is misleading. As I have pointed out, the phrase always presupposes a *preceding* account of the "generator," and re-introduces him merely to carry us onward to the history of his descendants. This re-introduction is accomplished in several ways, but in all cases the reference

is comparatively slight. In some cases the narrative recapitulates more or less briefly some previous account; or it may content itself with the briefest comment on the "generator's" character, or even upon his age. In Gen. v. 1, 2, a recapitulatory reference is made to chap. i. In chap. vi. 9, a brief reference is made to Noah's character before his progeny is given. In chap. x. 1, the narrative proceeds immediately to the begetting of the progeny, without giving any account of Shem, Ham, and Japheth, the progenitors. In chap. xi. 10, no account is given of Shem, except a mark of age. These examples will suffice to illustrate the usage, and I confidently leave it to the critical judgment of my readers to decide whether it is not critically misleading to write, as Dr. Driver does, that "the formula introduces some account of the *person himself*, named in it, as well as of his descendants." The truth is, that the formula always *presupposes* a *previous* account of the person himself named in it. But that statement of the case does not suit Dr. Driver's theory.

In Gen. ii. 4, there is precisely that kind of retrospective reference which the formula always implies. "These are the generations of the heaven and the earth, *when they were created*." The italicised words contain a direct reference to the creation of the heaven and earth as already recorded. Not only so, but a further brief introductory description of the earth and the heaven is given before the human progeny is brought upon the scene. If critical

analogy is to count for anything, the formula is in precisely the only place in which it can be made to fit perfectly. Yet, if that is its right place and relation, the hand that wrote JE was the same hand that wrote the formal periods of P. If any doubt remains, a comparison of the structure of Gen. ii. 4, 5, 6 with chap. v. 1, 2 will, I think, place the matter beyond reasonable dispute. The former is a JE, the latter a P, passage. The exactness of the parallel in the construction of the two passages would be amazing if it were accidental. The first passage runs—

“These are the generations of the heaven and the earth when they were created. In the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heaven, no plant of the field was yet in the earth, etc.”

The second passage reads—

“This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made He him, etc.”

The structure, the sequence, even the phrasing, run in precisely the same grooves. The second proves the integrity of the first, and the marks of one hand are upon both.

Great stress has been laid by the Higher Critics upon the different phraseology of the second chapter of Genesis as compared with the first. They tell us that P used the verb “to create,” while JE employed the verb “to form.” Uncritical haste has been made to earmark a distinctive vocabulary for different “documents” out of the insufficient data of the first

three or four chapters of Genesis. JE is by no means tied down to the use of the verb *yatzar* (to form), for he drops it completely out of use after the second chapter—a clear proof that he had used it with special significance. Even the Higher Critics allow Gen. ii. 4b to JE, and he there writes of the day when the Lord God “made” the earth and the heaven. I have before fully demonstrated that the former portion of the verse, which contains the verb “to create,” is also his. And let the reader turn to Gen. vi. 6, 7, an admittedly JE passage, and he will find that, when JE writes in a general way of the creation of the world and of man, he employs the formal terms “to create” and “to make,” precisely as P does. Again, in Gen. xxxvii. 2, the formula, “These are the generations of Jacob,” introduces a JE narrative, and must, unless criticism is to be reduced to sheer speculation, be assigned to the JE writer. The formal expression of Divine majesty in the plural number in P (Gen. i. 26): “Let us make man, etc.,” is strikingly paralleled in the JE writing of Genesis xi. 7: “Let us go down.” In a quasi-formal utterance of Jahveh in Gen. vi. 3, a distinct approach is marked to the formal expressions of P. “My Spirit shall not strive with man for ever” is reminiscent, both in conception and form, of the words, “And the Spirit of Elohim brooded upon the face of the waters.” “He also is flesh” anticipates the phraseology of chap. vi. 9: “All flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth.” And the formal

sentence, "His days shall be an hundred and twenty years" may be paralleled in almost every alternate verse of chapter v.

The foregoing examples demonstrate that, when the JE section approaches the formal standpoint of P, the literary style and phraseology of the former assume a growing likeness to those of the latter. The natural conclusion from this fact is supported by the supplementary feature that, whenever P approximates to the informal standpoint of JE, its style becomes distinctly assimilated to that of the latter. The fifth chapter of Genesis is declared by the Higher Critics to be a portion of the P document; yet the 29th verse is admittedly written in the style and diction of JE. Here, as in so many other cases, speculative imagination and the useful "Redactor" are summoned to remove the embarrassment. The critics inform us that there must have existed a JE genealogy parallel to the one which is given by P in the fifth chapter of Genesis; and that the "Redactor" discarded it in favour of the latter, but saved two or three sentences from the wreck, and inserted a tiny fragment in Gen. v. 29. To give this imaginative licence the semblance of critical form, the critics maintain that the Pentateuch affords evidence that the "Redactor" preferred P to JE, and would therefore naturally adopt the genealogy of the former. The proofs of this preference in the Pentateuch are truly remarkable! For example, in the account of the destruction of the cities of the plain,

the supposed "Redactor" has presented us with forty-six verses of JE's narration, while there is only one single verse of the narrative which the critics can assign to P. The hypothesis of the rejected genealogy is devoid of probability. The conjecture of the preservation of this small shred, out of a complete genealogy distinguished by vivid and picturesque suggestions, lacks even plausibility. If, however, we read the narrative simply and naturally, and discern the appropriateness with which the writer, on reaching the epoch-making name of Noah, is moved to break through the formal style of the passage into vivid and glowing utterance, we cannot but perceive in the very naturalness of it how strong is its critical probability.

So great are the affinities manifested by certain passages of P with the freer style of JE that phrases may be quoted, all falling unquestionably within P itself, which might with great plausibility be assigned to a different writer on the ground of variancy of conception and style. Take, for example, the following passages, all taken from the writings claimed for P. "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. . . . And God said, Let there be light, and there was light." With this majestic conception of the universal God compare the following representations: "And He left talking with him, and Elohim *went up* from Abraham" (Gen. xvii. 22). "And Elohim went up from him in the place where He spake with

him" (Gen. xxxv. 13). The interval of conception between the sublime majesty set forth in the first of these passages, and the vivid anthropomorphism of the other two, is as striking as any variations that can be shown within the limits of the Pentateuch, yet the Higher Critics admit their organic unity within the one P document. The latter passages which describe Elohim as "going up" from Abraham and Jacob, have their clear counterpart in the JE writing of Gen. xi. 5: "And Jahveh *came down* to see the city."

Gen. xvii. is assigned to P from the beginning to the end, but the variety of literary style and expression found in it is most remarkable, some of the more vivid portions being quite after the manner of JE. The 11th and 12th verses are a good example of the ordinary P style: "And ye shall be circumcised in the flesh of your foreskin, and it shall be a token of a covenant betwixt Me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every male throughout your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger which is not of thy seed." Contrast with the rigid formality of that passage the following: "And Abram fell on his face, and Elohim talked with him." "Then Abraham fell upon his face, and laughed, and said in his heart, Shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old?" It surely cannot be denied that these last passages bear a far closer

resemblance to the ordinary style of JE than to that of P. Compare with them the following JE passages: "And Sarah laughed within herself, saying, After I am old shall I have pleasure, my lord being old also?" (Gen. xviii. 12). "And she said, Who would have said unto Abraham, that Sarah should give children suck? For I have borne him a son in his old age" (Gen. xxi. 7). I confidently put it to the critical judgment of my readers that there is no such divergency of thought and style between the foregoing passages from P and JE respectively as to make single authorship improbable. I venture further, and suggest that the likeness is so great that there is strong critical probability in favour of the affirmation that they were written, not by distinct authors, but by one and the same person.

VII

THE ARGUMENT FROM DISCREPANCIES

HAVING exposed the groundlessness of the "single name" theory, and demonstrated the psychological unity in which the variant forms of composition are included, we now find ourselves confronted with another confidently chosen line of defence which the critics have set up. We are assured that the independency of the documents is clearly evidenced by the discrepancies and contradictions which appear in the narratives compiled out of these incongruous elements. It is maintained that the "Compilers" were so absolutely deficient in the ordinary sense of harmony and verisimilitude that they patched together in immediately succeeding sentences accounts which flatly and obtrusively contradicted one another. This is a most highly improbable assumption to begin with, but let that pass for the present. The Higher Critics affirm that the sequence of these contradictory narratives can be distinctly followed apart, as they are patched together in the crudest mosaic, without intermingling, and in bald incongruity. Clearly, if this singular and incredible thing can be shown

to be hard and substantial fact, we can only admit that truth is indeed much stranger than fiction, and concede the case to the Higher Critic; while we prepare ourselves to lend a ready ear henceforth to the wildest improbabilities. In diction and the like J and E refuse to be separated, because, as Dr. Driver admits, "the phraseological criteria are slight"; which means, that, if you allow even the slightest shade of difference of psychological standpoint for Jahveh and Elohim, there are no "phraseological criteria" at all by which to sunder them into independent documents. But, if it can be shown that the J and E accounts lie together in a mosaic of mutually contradictory passages, the incredibly obtuse "Compiler" will have made their independency manifest by a colossal stupidity which cannot be paralleled in literature. With respect to JE and P, it is maintained that they have been flung together by another "Redactor," whose heedlessness of the most glaring contradictions was equally astonishing, and whose stupidity was equally colossal. Now, even if one might legitimately assume one such monstrosity, it demands unusual faith to believe that either chance or design could ever have produced such another.

It is neither possible nor necessary within the limits of this volume to follow the Higher Critics through all the cases of discrepancy which they fancy they have discovered. The difficulty of sup-

posed or apparent discrepancies is not new, and my readers can find appropriate aids to deal with them in detail at their leisure. It will be enough for our present purpose to take certain principal and typical instances, and to demonstrate representatively through these crucial cases that the narratives, instead of being discrepant, form a continuous and consistent whole. In this way the core of the discrepancy theory will be removed, and the disposal of the remainder will be but a detail.

I know of no instance in which Dr. Driver presents a more confident case for complete discrepancy in the JE narrative than in the account of the sale of Joseph by his brethren, recorded in Gen. xxxvii. Dr. Driver's triumphant exposition of this discrepancy is given in the following terms:—

“Though the analysis of chapter xxxvii. is in parts uncertain, the differences of representation which it exhibits show that it is of composite origin. Thus ver. 28 is not the continuation of vv. 25–27: notice the indefinite expression, “and there passed by Midianites, merchantmen,” which evidently describes the *first* appearance of merchants upon the scene: the *sequel* to ver. 25 would have been expressed by, “and *the* Ishmaelites drew near” (or some similar verb, but with the subject *definite*): ver. 28 is thus *parallel* to vv. 25–27, not the sequel to them. Notice, further, that it is *twice* said that Joseph was brought into Egypt and

sold there; once, xxxvii. 36, by the *Midianites*, in agreement with ver. 28*a*; the other time, xxxix. 1, by the *Ishmaelites*, in agreement with ver. 28*b*. Again, if in ver. 28 the subject of "they drew" be Joseph's brethren, it is strange, as Reuben appears clearly to be in their company, that, going afterwards to the pit, he should be surprised at not finding Joseph in it; on the other hand, if "they" refer to the Midianite merchants passing by, who drew up Joseph from the pit without his brothers' knowledge, the surprise of Reuben is at once explained, and the expression in xl. 10, "for I was stolen out of the land of the Hebrews," exactly describes what had occurred. If xxxvii. 19-21, 25-27, 28*b* (And they sold . . . silver), 31-35, xxxix. 1, etc., on the one hand, and xxxvii. 22-24, 28*a*, 29-30, 36, on the other, be read consecutively, they will be found to form two complete *parallel* accounts of the manner in which Joseph was taken into Egypt, each (as will appear presently) connecting with two corresponding narratives in the chapters following: in one (J) Joseph is sold by his brethren to *Ishmaelites*, in the other (E) he is cast by his brethren into a pit, and stolen thence by the *Midianites* without his brothers' knowledge. Ver. 21 is tautologous beside ver. 22*a*, but forms an excellent introduction to vv. 25-27. Notice that in J Judah takes the lead . . . in E Reuben: it is not impossible that (as has been suggested) "Reuben in ver. 21 was originally 'Judah.'"

Putting it briefly, the Compiler has, according to Dr. Driver, hung together with inconceivable stupidity two accounts which contradict one another in such a violent and obvious manner that the veriest schoolboy would have recoiled from compounding such an incongruity. Yet this very Compiler is supposed to have inserted in Gen. xxvi., for the purpose of reconciling contradictions, a number of verses of his own composition, although there would have been no necessary contradictions in that chapter if those harmonising verses were omitted. Truly, these Compilers grow more and more astonishing on increased acquaintance with them.

The pith of Dr. Driver's statement is that one story asserts that Joseph was carried away by Ishmaelites, and the other by Midianites. This is the glaring discrepancy which splits up the narrative into two parallel accounts. If one could not find the key to the language of the ancient writer, the ingenuity of the dissecting knife might have caused us some perplexity. Fortunately, the key is given in the Old Testament itself. In the eighth chapter of the book of Judges, a description is given in the twenty-fourth verse of certain spoils taken in battle from the Midianites; and these words occur: "Because they (*i.e.* the Midianites) were Ishmaelites." In this one flash of light the duality so laboriously built up by the Higher Critic already totters to its fall, and the perils of discrepancy-hunting are strikingly exhibited. This simple sentence reminds

us that apparent discrepancy in a complex narrative may be due merely to insufficiency of information on the part of the reader. From the above passage in the book of Judges it is clear that the term Ishmaelites had been widened so as to embrace the genus of caravan merchants or traders, and among these the Midianites had evidently taken a prominent position, which accounted for the rich spoils taken by Israel from the defeated nation. The terms Midianites and Ishmaelites, therefore, in the narrative of Joseph, are not conflicting, but of identical signification, and the writer was as free to use the one as the other.

But, beyond this, the unity of the narrative is conclusively shown by the fact that these terms are used with intelligible discrimination, and not arbitrarily. Dr. Driver's theory has led him to miss the whole point of the words, "And there passed by Midianite merchants." He says that this "evidently describes the *first appearance* of merchants upon the scene." It does not evidently do anything of the kind; it simply and obviously describes the first "passing by" of the merchants, and the change of term exactly answers to the changing conditions depicted in the narrative. The brothers first "lifted up their eyes and looked," and saw a merchant train from Gilead coming in the distance. In the distance they recognised them as belonging to the genus of caravan merchants, *i.e.* as Ishmaelities, but were naturally unable to specify them more precisely.

But, when they came near, and "passed by," the brothers recognised them more precisely as belonging to the Midianite branch of Ishmaelitic traders. Instead of being indefinite, as Dr. Driver declares, the beginning of the twenty-eighth verse supplies the more definite and specific designation. Set the two appellations in order, and any one can see how perfect the sequence is. "And they lifted up their eyes, and looked, and behold, a travelling company of *Ishmaelites* came from Gilead. . . . And there *passed by Midianite* merchants." The appropriateness of this sequence is so perfect that it is sufficient, in my judgment, to establish the unity of the narrative. And even in the remaining cases in which these merchants are designated by the narrator, either studied or instinctive discrimination is discoverable. In chapter xxxvii. 36 these merchants are definitely in the foreground as the subject of the action, and are therefore definitely designated. But in chapter xxxix. 1 they recede into the more general background as traders with whom Potiphar, who now occupies the definite foreground, deals. "The *Midianites* sold him unto Potiphar. . . . Potiphar bought him of the hand of the *Ishmaelites*." If the foregoing perfection of appropriate discrimination is an accidental result of jumbling two mutually contradictory narratives together, all grounds of reasoning criticism are at an end, for accident and design are no longer distinguishable from one another.

When Dr. Driver makes a point of the fact that Joseph's being sold into Egypt is recorded *twice*, as if that proved two narratives, he exemplifies a constant vice of the Higher Criticism, viz. the insistence upon forcing the Pentateuch into the compass of modern criteria unsanctioned by the actual contents of the record. The recapitulation of an event previously narrated, such as is found in chapter xxxix. 1, is thoroughly characteristic of the Pentateuch. Let any one compare, for example, Gen. i. 27 with Gen. v. 1, 2, and remember that these parallel passages are ascribed by Dr. Driver himself to the same author. How often must one insist that the critics should treat the Pentateuchal writing according to its own laws, and not according to their own arbitrary rules and axioms? Because Reuben intervenes on Joseph's behalf at one stage, and Judah at another, these brothers must, forsooth, be respectively assigned to the championship of two different authors. To suit the Higher Critic's idea of unity, history must have no angles, and run in nothing but straight lines. Such a conception of history betrays a lack of genuine historical imagination in the Higher Critics; and this is even more plainly evinced in the claim that Joseph's declaration in Gen. xl, "For indeed I was stolen away out of the land of the Hebrews," does not agree with the story that he was sold by his brothers. Such pedantic inelasticity of imagination is almost enough to take one's breath away. Is it at all likely that

Joseph would inform the imprisoned butler and baker that his own brothers had sold him to passing merchants? The form in which he put it was delicate, but substantially true. He had been stolen—stolen in the first place from his father by his brothers. And even the Ishmaelites must have guessed that the affair was not an honest one. The whole transaction was a theft. It is indeed difficult to be patient with a quibbling and pedantic criticism which seems incognisant of the broad movements and motives which operate in human history. These frigid hair-splitting exactitudes are remote from the realities of life, and constitute one of the grave defects of the Higher Criticism.

Dr. Driver's statement that the Pentateuchal record contains "two *complete* parallel accounts of the manner in which Joseph was taken to Egypt" will not bear examination. The E, or Midianite, story runs as follows when it is torn out of its organic relation with the remainder of the complete narrative: "The brothers see Joseph coming afar off, and conspire against his life. Reuben persuades them to spare his life and cast him into a pit, and they acted according to his persuasion. Then Midianite merchantmen passed by and drew Joseph out of the pit, and conveyed him away to Egypt." We need not go further for our present scrutiny, for this brief excerpt is full of gaps and improbabilities. How could passing merchants know that Joseph was in the pit? Were his brothers likely to

place him in the path of passing caravans? Was it a usual occurrence for merchant trains to find young men in pits, and did they send parties out to scour the country in search of them? The narrative treats the taking of Joseph out of the pit as a matter of course. There is no hint that the Midianites made any special discovery. The whole tone of the narrative implies that those who drew him forth knew perfectly well beforehand that he was there, and how he came there. No questions were asked, and none were answered. The natural explanation of this otherwise inexplicable feature is, that the Midianites did not find Joseph in the pit, but received him by purchase from the hands of his brothers.

The other fragment, when torn asunder from its connection in the narrative, is equally incomplete. Together they form a whole as harmonious as it is true to the complexity of life. The only point that is not made clear is the reason for Reuben's temporary absence from his brethren; but it would be an exaggeration to call it a difficulty, for it is easy enough to conceive of different ways in which it may have occurred. What one cannot allow in a narrative is, that it should be both historically and dramatically unintelligible, as I have demonstrated the Midianite fragment to be when taken by itself.

Thus the unity of this narrative is critically proved to the last line. I have shown that the different terms applied to the merchants are not independent and haphazard, but employed with the appropriate

discrimination of a unifying and relating mind ; and I have also demonstrated that the so-called J and E sections give a grotesque and unreal picture until they are joined in an organic whole. Then the narrative becomes full, intelligible, and harmonious. This demonstration obviously proves that J and E are one. We have overthrown the argument from discrepancy in a thoroughly crucial case ; the rest is detail. The unity of J and E will be shown in other ways before this volume is closed, but the proof is already complete. The entire failure of the plausible example of supposed discrepancy which we have now examined already determines the issue in the case of J and E. Our next step is the examination of a similarly crucial case as between JE and P.

The first case in this connection shall be the narrative of the spies in the book of Numbers. This account furnishes a good example of the method adopted by the Higher Critics in the quest for discrepancies, and will enable us to show that their treatment of Genesis is in no way different from their handling of the rest of the Pentateuch. The story of the spies is given in Num. xiii. and xiv. Dr. Driver shall detail the discrepancies in his own words:—

“The double character of the narrative is very evident. Observe (1) that xiii. 22 is *parallel* to ver. 21 ; ver. 32 to vv. 27–31 ; and xiv. 26–34 to xiv. 11, 22–25. Observe (2) the difference of representation which characterises the two accounts :

in JE the spies go only as far as the neighbourhood of Hebron, in the south of Judah (xiii. 22-24); in P they explore the *whole country*, to Rehob (Judges xviii. 28) in the far north (xiii. 21: with this agrees the expression in xiii. 32 and xiv. 7, "*through which we have passed*"): in JE, upon their return, they represent the land as a fertile one, but one which the Israelites have not the means of conquering (xiii. 27-31); in P they represent it as one that "eateth up its inhabitants," *i.e.* as an impoverished land (see Lev. xxvi. 38; Ez. xxxvi. 13), not worth conquering (xiii. 32): in JE Joshua is not named as one of the spies, and *Caleb alone* stills the people, and is exempted in consequence from the sentence of exclusion from Palestine (xiii. 30; xiv. 24); in P Joshua as well as Caleb is among the spies; *both* are named as pacifying the people, and are exempted accordingly from the sentence of exclusion (xiv. 6, 30, 38; *cf.* 26, 65 P). This last difference is remarkable, and will meet us again: had the whole narrative been by a single writer, who thought of Joshua as acting in concert with Caleb, it is difficult not to think that Joshua would have been mentioned beside Caleb—not, possibly, in xiii. 30, but—in xiv. 24, when the exemption from the sentence of exclusion from Palestine is first promised. In P the spies start from the wilderness of Paran (xiii. 3; *cf.* 26); in JE, though it is not here so stated, it may be inferred from Num.

xxxii. 8 (*cf.* Deut. i. 19; Josh. xiv. 6) that they started from Kadesh; and with this agree the words *to Kadesh* in xiii. 26. If the passages assigned to the two narratives be read continuously, it will be found that each is nearly as complete as in the case of the narrative of the Flood in Genesis; only the beginning in JE is replaced by the fuller particulars from P. The phraseology of the two narratives differs as usual."

My readers will perceive that I am doing the Higher Critics full justice in choosing the above narrative as a crucial case in test of the theory of discrepancies as between JE and P. Nothing can exceed the confidence with which Dr. Driver marshals the numerous contradictions which he believes he has discovered. According to his exposition, the passage simply teems with representations in violent conflict with one another; so much so, that it would be difficult to parallel such a preposterous mixture even in the literature of comedy. But the Higher Criticism is sadly lacking in the sense of humour. As to the phraseology of the narrative, we have already critically considered the phraseology of JE and P, with certain very definite results. Dr. Driver compares the completeness of the JE narrative of the spies with that of the JE account of the Flood, asserting that the former is *nearly* as complete as the latter. This is distinctly amusing, when one remembers that the latter does not even

give any account of the making of the ark. In the former also Dr. Driver admits that the account has no beginning, and must be supplied from P. Putting it briefly, in order to make a *complete* narrative, you must put together the two parts which the Higher Critics are striving to separate. In the interest of sober criticism, it is important to observe that any complex narrative could be split up into incompletely continuous parts by the methods adopted in the Pentateuch by the Higher Critics, for the very essence of complexity in narration is the reconsideration and repetition of the same facts from varying points of view. The "straight line" history which the Higher Critics demand exists only in their own imagination.

The hopeless confusion of staring contradictions to which Dr. Driver reduces this narrative raises again the question, "What manner of being was the 'Redactor' who piled these absurd discrepancies together?" I assume we are allowed to take it for granted that he understood the Hebrew language. And it must be further borne in mind that it was this very same individual who, if he ever existed, wove such a cunning web in Gen. vii. 6 ff., in order to avoid the semblance of disharmony. And more, it was this very same "Redactor" who was so sensitive to differences that he could not bear the sight of the name Jahveh (after a succession of Elohims) in the second chapter of Genesis, and therefore with

fastidious delicacy wrote Jahveh Elohim instead. Yet in the narrative of the spies he has absolutely no sense of discrepancy, according to Dr. Driver's findings, but carelessly flings together different accounts which, to put it plainly, in gross obviousness give one another the lie. Surely, the necessity of conjecturing such an unheard-of being as this "Redactor" is an argument of no little weight against the whole position of the Higher Criticism. It should at least induce great caution and modesty in its operations and deductions.

Let us test Dr. Driver's "discrepancies." He says that in JE the spies represent Canaan as a fertile land; in P as an impoverished land *not worth conquering*. The former of these statements is, of course, correct; but for the latter statement which Dr. Driver makes there is not an atom of ground. It is singular how a man's judgment becomes perverted by the need of finding discrepancies. In the so-called P section the spies say that it is "a land that eateth up the inhabitants thereof." For the meaning of this phrase Dr. Driver refers us to two passages (Lev. xxvi. 38; Ez. xxxvi. 13) which distinctly contradict his interpretation. This is not a private preserve for Hebrew scholarship; any reader can judge for himself. The passage in Leviticus makes no reference to unfertility of land, but to destruction and desolation in warfare: "And ye shall have no power to stand before your enemies. And ye

shall perish among the nations, and *the land of your enemies shall eat you up.*"

The passage in Ezekiel is also remote from any reference to Canaan as being an unfruitful land, and obviously alludes to the destruction of the nation of Israel through the evils which warlike nations had been permitted to bring upon it on account of its sins: "Because they say unto you, Thou land art a *devourer of men*, and hast been a bereaver of thy nation; therefore thou shalt devour men no more." By no reasonable process can this phrase be made to contradict the account of the land's wonderful fertility. The most imposing of the supposed discrepancies which Dr. Driver presents is purely imaginary and utterly unwarranted. The remainder of the points urged have no weight. When the ancient site of Kadesh and the ancient limits of the wilderness of Paran have been fixed, it will be soon enough to talk of discrepancy between them. In the meantime, we may take it for granted that the discrepancy is similar to that between Luke's Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles, in the former of which the ascension of Christ is reported to have taken place at Bethany, while in the latter the disciples after the ascension are said to have returned from the mount called Olivet. There is not a shadow of contradiction between Num. xiii. 21 and 22. The former verse records generally that the spies traversed the whole land from south to north; the latter adds the detail that in

penetrating from the south they came to Hebron and the valley of Eshcol, from which the grapes were taken as an illustration of the fruitfulness of the country. The wider search is assumed in ver. 22. having been already recorded in ver. 21, and the one special point of the investigation is emphasised because it figured prominently in the report of the spies upon their return. The case of Caleb and Joshua is precisely one of those complex histories of which actual life is full. Dr. Driver's difficulty arises from the illegitimate demand for a "straight line" history. The record as it stands is far more natural, far truer to life. Caleb and Joshua were in agreement on the question at issue, but Caleb acted as spokesman, and by his promptitude gained at least a temporary pre-eminence. When the struggle developed, Joshua joined his uttered protest to that of his comrade. When the Lord proclaimed the reward for this fidelity, he recognised the leadership of Caleb, and attached the guerdon to Caleb's name. But this did not exclude Joshua, but rather *representatively* included him as Caleb's seconder. But in the more formal covenant which followed (distinguished by its formal phraseology), both names are expressly given with that precision which marks the formal passages of the author of the Pentateuch. But even in this more precise form of the promise of exemption (Num. xiv. 30) the first place is given to Caleb, a preference which is quite inexplicable unless the writer of

this P section also wrote the JE portion in which Caleb is reported to have been foremost in that particular action for which this reward was bestowed. The premier position which is given to Caleb in ver. 30 (P) cannot, it is evident, be understood from the P account in ver. 6, for in that particular case Joshua is to the fore; it must therefore be due to the lead which Caleb had previously taken, as recorded in the so-called JE section. It is clear that there must have been some distinct and specific reason for placing Caleb first in ver. 30, for Joshua speedily became the more prominent figure historically, and the writer in the usual course of things would naturally put his name first (*cf.* ver. 38). Such delicate correspondences as these are the strongest proofs of fundamental unity, and the variety of motive, impulse, and action, which the complete narrative supplies, is far more natural and lifelike than the rigid lines of artificial consistency into which the Higher Criticism would split up these glorious old records. Dr. Driver's pyramid of discrepancies has turned out to be a monument of vital unities.

The present chapter would not be quite complete without a brief exposition of the fallacies of the Higher Criticism in its attempt to find discrepancies and contradictions between the account of the general creation of the world given in Gen. i.-ii. 3, and the description of the formation of Adam and Eve which

is given in Gen. ii. 4-25. The following is Kuenen's statement :—

“Here we find side by side the two creation stories. The division of the work of creation into six days is entirely unknown to the second story. Moreover, the order of creation is quite different in the second: first, the man is created (ver. 7), then trees and plants (ver. 8 sq.), then animals (ver. 19), and, lastly, the woman (vv. 21, 22)!”

Dr. Driver's position is in this case, as it usually is in the criticism of the Pentateuch, a simple repetition of Kuenen's. Yet it would be difficult to imagine a deduction more deficient in critical penetration and insight. To call Gen. ii. 4-25 a second “story of the creation” is a misrepresentation so heedless that it is, in a critical work, quite unpardonable. Any one who claims to be a critic ought to know full well that it is a common thing to find in the Pentateuch the statement of some event in general terms followed by a more particular elaboration of the details of its unfolding, and that within sections the unity of which is not disputed by any one. The record of Gen. ii. 4 ff. plainly indicates in the opening words that it is *not* designed to give an account of the creation. The words: “These are the generations of the heaven and the earth *when they were created*,” presuppose, as I have before shown, that the account of the creation has been *already given*; and I have completely demonstrated that they belong to the narrative which immediately ensues. But,

even setting these words aside, the following words, "In the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven, no plant of the field was yet in the earth, etc.," contain an obvious reference to a *previous* account of the "making of the earth and the heaven." This section, therefore, far from proceeding to give an independent "story of the creation," distinctly presupposes the account that has already been given, and proceeds to develop in connection with that account "the *generations* of the heavens and the earth," *i.e.* the specific production of those first members of the human family who came into being in direct connection with creative processes. The general account of creation had not supplied a record of these "generations," but had prepared the way for them by announcing generally the creation of the human *genus*.

The key to the special distinction of this first record of the human generations is the verb *yatzar* (to form). This is one of the words which have persuaded Dr. Driver that we have here a different writer from the writer of the first chapter; because, as he argues, the latter does not use the verb *yatzar* (to form), but the word *bara* (to create). But the writer of Gen. ii. 4 *ff.* does not employ the word *yatzar* after this chapter in any single passage of the Pentateuch, so that it is by no means a favourite word in his vocabulary. On the other hand, he uses elsewhere the verbs *bara* (to create) and *hasa* (to make), as the writer of Gen. i. does, and as he has

himself done in Gen. ii. 4. He must, therefore, have used the special verb *yatzar* in this first narrative of the "generations" with a selective purpose.

What, then, is the meaning of *yatzar*? It means the moulding of something into a particular form according to a given design. It immediately implies "relation," for the relations of things are determined by their "form." This comprehensive implication of the word is well brought out in Job xvii. 7, where the plural passive participle of the same verb is employed to denote the "members" of the human body, that is, literally construed, "things fashioned in mutual relation."

The writer of Gen. ii. 4 *ff.* has, therefore, intimated to us, as plainly as words can convey his meaning, that his purpose is *not* to give a chronological account of the *creation*, but a particular conception of the *fashioning* of the first human "generations" in their appropriate *relations* to the order of things into which they were introduced. If we adopt the true method of criticism, and be guided by the writer's own language, instead of following our own speculations, we shall perceive that there is an order of *relation* which is even more important than that of *chronology*, and that this order of relation is supplied in the second chapter of Genesis.

In this arrangement man, of course, occupies the foreground, because all other things are made for him. In the intention and relation of things he is first. His first and elementary relation is to the

food which is produced to sustain his existence. His next relation is to the animal world which he dominates and names. His highest relation is to the woman who is to be his helpmeet. This order has nothing to do with the time when they were created. In determinative "form" and relation, the last may be, and often is, first.

This order of relation shows a symmetrically ascending scale. First appear the things that supply life's lowest necessities; next the stimulative relation of the subordinated animal world; and lastly, the relation of equal fellowship with the woman who was "bone of his bones, and flesh of his flesh."

In harmony with this conception, the narrative begins, not with the beginning of creation, but at the point where the created world was waiting for the hand of man to reduce its indefiniteness into definite order, system, and arrangement: "No plant of the *field* was yet in the *earth*, and no herb of the *field* had yet sprung up; for the Lord God had not caused it to rain upon the *earth*, and there was not a man to till the *ground*. But there went up a mist from the *earth*, and watered the whole face of the *ground*." The italics will assist the reader to see with what perfect discrimination the writer of the above passage has chosen his words. The cultivable soil was an unordered miscellaneity, needing the hand of man to order, arrange, specialise, and develop its products. He does not say that no plant or herb of the *earth* had yet sprung up; but of the *field*. It

was specialisation that was lacking. God made the earth, but man made the field. The mist that watered the face of the ground had not yet attained to the specialised form of showers of rain, but, being the precursor of the days of rain, gave indication that the time of the "tiller of the ground" was drawing near. Just as, at the beginning of the creation, the earth was vague and formless, waiting for the hand of God to specialise it into order, so, immediately before the beginning of human history, the cultivable ground was vague and formless, waiting for the hand of man to perform a like service for it. This remarkable analogy of conception is another of those numerous subtle links which bind these writings into a profound unity. It is perfectly true that the phraseology of this section is very striking and distinctive; it could not well be otherwise.

Not only is the discrepancy a fiction, and the unity complete, but this section is absolutely necessary to the sequence and integrity of the Pentateuch. The "generations of the heaven and the earth" must, of necessity, first be given, in order to prepare the way for the next step, viz. the generations of Adam in Gen. v. 1. As the sections stand, the unity and symmetry of the whole is perfect. Gen. ii. 4 retrospectively links itself with the creation of the heaven and the earth in the first chapter, and, by giving the "generations" which had their starting-point in the creation, prepared the way for the generations of the first father of the race. I have sufficiently demon-

strated how discrepancies are manufactured. Neither as between J and E nor as between JE and P will they bear critical examination. On the contrary, new and unexpected affinities disclose themselves in the progress of a thorough-going critical scrutiny. *Ab uno disce omnes.*

VIII

THE INTER-DEPENDENCE OF J, E, AND P

OUR destructive criticism of the Compilation Theory is now sufficiently complete to enable us to proceed with our demonstration in a more directly constructive form. It is fundamental to this theory to deny the inter-dependence of its assumed "independent" documents, J, E, and P; so that the demonstration of such inter-dependence will be obviously fatal to its claims.

With respect to J and E, the inter-dependence is so constant, minute, and complete, that one can only wonder at the critical perversity which has ingeniously attempted to evade the facts. To begin with, quoting Dr. Driver's own words, "E first appears in the history of Abraham (chap. xv. or xx.)." As to chap. xv., Dr. Driver writes, "Chap. xv. shows signs of composition; but the criteria are indecisive, and no generally accepted analysis has been effected; it is therefore printed in the table *between* the J and E lines." The simple meaning of these formal phrases, when translated into ordinary speech, is this: Chap. xv. cannot be assigned to E, because the writer of it employs the name Jahveh, and not Elohim, for the

Deity. The writing, therefore, naturally falls to J. But, it is found, on examination, that the weft of the composition shows threads which would compel the Higher Critics to admit that J and E are one. So perfectly homogeneous is this weft, and so decisive is the complete absence of the name Elohim, that the critics are nonplussed. They cannot satisfactorily sunder the threads, and their theory will not allow them to assign the chapter unreservedly to J. So, instead of frankly admitting the testimony of chap. xv. to the inter-dependence and unity of J and E, they evade the issue by declaring that "the chapter shows signs of composition ; but the criteria are indecisive."

It is not claimed that E appears again until chap. xx. Let my readers face this fact fairly, unbiassed by the speculative theories of the Higher Criticism. If there was an independent history by an E writer, running on parallel lines with a J narrative, and evincing such splendid literary and other qualities as are apparent in the so-called E sections, how comes it that the "Compiler" rejected all this valuable matter down to as late a date as the history of Abraham, and then, suddenly utilising the ignored treasure, made his narrative henceforth a dual one? But I am forgetting. We have already discovered that the fantastic tricks of this *deus ex machina* are not subject to any law, whether human or divine. It is enough for my readers to observe that the narrative E, which commences at the twentieth

chapter of Genesis, is obviously dependent for its historical antecedence upon the narrative J which is contained in the previous chapters. The only way of escape from unity is by the assumption of improbable freaks performed by an impossible "Compiler."

The final and conclusive evidence of the interdependence of J and E is, however, supplied in the narratives in which J and E passages are unmistakably joined in complete organic unity. Let us take, for example, Gen. xxii. 8-14. In these verses Elohim and Jahveh each appear three times, a clear proof that, if there is anywhere an intermixture of J and E documents, it is found here. Yet the narrative here is absolutely and inviolably homogeneous, a web without a seam. "Abraham and Isaac journey on together; they come to the place appointed; Abraham builds the altar, and proceeds to slay his son; the angel intervenes; the vicarious ram is discovered in the thicket; the ram is sacrificed; and Abraham names the place according to the assurance which he had given Isaac in the eighth verse." A striking finish is given to this demonstration by the fact that the name "Jahveh Jireh" in verse 14 distinctly refers to the words "Elohim Jireh" in verse 8, thus completely blotting out the supposed distinction of Jahveh and Elohim documents. So unanswerable is this demonstration that Dr. Driver has apparently assigned chap. xxii. 1-14, Jahvehs and all, to the E document! A more complete *reductio ad absurdum* is unthinkable.

Even a single crucial case like the foregoing is conclusive as against the Compilation Theory of J and E, but it may be well to give one further exposure of the fatuity of the criticism which has sundered the JE section of the Pentateuch into discrepant and "independent" documents. For this example we will take the account of Jacob's dream in Gen. xxviii. 10-22. The first words of verse 16, "And Jacob awaked out of his sleep," are clearly dependent upon the account in verse 11, "And he . . . lay down in that place to sleep." Yet the former is assigned to J, and the latter to E. The words in verses 16 and 19, "The Lord is in *this place*" and "He called the name of *that place* Bethel," plainly depend upon verse 11, "And he lighted upon a *certain place*." But the last of these is E, and the two former are J. Also, the J writing (verse 19), narrating the naming of the place as Bethel, or house of God, obviously depends upon the E exclamation (verse 17), "This is none other than the house of God." Further, the words of Jacob's vow in verses 20, 21 (E), "If Elohim will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go, etc.," manifestly recall the promise of Jahveh in verse 15 (J), "And, behold, I am with thee, and will keep thee whithersoever thou goest, etc." Further still, the words in verse 13 (J), "the land whereon thou liest," refer directly to a portion of verse 11 (E), "he . . . lay down in that place to sleep." And further still, the words of verse 21 (assigned to E), "then shall

Jahveh be my Elohim," are intelligible only in the light of verse 13 (J), "And, behold, Jahveh stood above it."

The criticism that claims to find duality, and even discrepancy, in such a closely interfibred organism as this must be as careless as it is perverse. The genius of the Higher Criticism is well displayed in Dr. Driver's decree that verse 13 must be "rendered, as margin of Revised Version," *i.e.* "And Jahveh stood *beside him*," instead of, "And Jahveh stood *above it*." Dr. Driver seems to think that this change will create some semblance of discrepancy; but I have already completely demonstrated that the whole narrative is an intimately interwoven unity. Even if the narrative related that the angels (in the dream) ascended and descended by the up-towering stairway, while God Himself appeared at Jacob's side, there would not be the slightest shadow of discrepancy in the representation. If E had represented God as standing on the stairway, and J had represented Him as being by the side of Jacob, a charge of inconsistency might possibly be urged. But this is not the case. E speaks only of the "angels of Elohim," and does not mention the appearance of God Himself at all (*vide* verse 12). With this distinction verses 16 and 17 are also imbued. The former verse (J) speaks of Jahveh Himself as being present; but the latter describes the relation of God to the place in such general terms as would be justified by a simple vision of angels; for

their presence would suffice to mark it as the "house of Elohim and the gate of heaven." In the twenty-eighth chapter there is no suggestion made by E that the angels seen by Jacob made any communication to him ; and a general vision of angels, through which no communication from God is imparted, is never represented in the Pentateuch as equivalent to the manifested presence of God. In this chapter, therefore, it is only the J section that represents God Himself as appearing to Jacob. But, if my readers will now turn to chap. xxxv. 1-8, and bear in mind that those verses are assigned to the E writer, they will find a proof of the inter-dependence of J and E as signal as it is sufficing. The first words of this E section are a bold and pronounced reference to the theophany narrated by J in chap. xxviii. : "Arise, go up to Bethel, . . . and make there an altar unto Elohim, who *appeared* unto thee when thou fleddest from the face of Esau thy brother." The word "appear," in reference to God, always implies, in the Pentateuchal writings, the personal presence of God for the making of a communication. It is only J that has narrated the appearing of God to Jacob at Bethel, and it is necessarily to that narrative that the E section in chap. xxxv. has reference. The personal distinctness and definiteness of God's appearance on that occasion is still more strongly emphasised by the E writing in chap. xxxv. 7 : "Because there God was *revealed* unto him when he fled from the face of his brother." The word translated

"revealed" is a strong word, and means literally, to lay bare or open. It implies a self-manifestation clear, distinct, and emphatic, such as J describes in chap. xxviii. The inter-dependence of J and E is complete; the twain are one.

I have shown that the change of translation decreed by Dr. Driver is of no service to his case; yet the probability is that the text, and not the margin, of the Revised Version is right, after all. The first and natural meaning of the Hebrew preposition *hal* is "above" or "upon." And the natural reference of the pronoun associated with it in chap. xxviii. 13, is the same as that of the similar pronoun in the previous verse, namely, to the stairway of Jacob's dream. The two verses then run in their natural sequence; "The angels of Elohim ascended and descended *along* the stairway, and Jahveh stood *upon*, or *above*, the stairway." Hebrew readers will notice the neat parallel between *halim bo* and *nitzab halaiv*.

It is true that *hal* takes the meaning "near to," as one of its secondary significations, just as we say in English that one thing is "hard *upon*" another; but, as the primary meaning is in the present case the best suited to the context, there is no need to look for another; and the revisers did wisely in refusing to make a change in the text of the English Bible. This is a small matter, but it illustrates the assiduity with which any semblance of discrepancy is diligently sought for

by the Higher Criticism, and the eager one-sidedness of its operations. But, as far as J and E are concerned, my task is now virtually complete. If, in the face of these demonstrations, any one can still believe that they are not an organic unity, his logical faculty is beyond the range of my comprehension.

The demonstration of the inter-dependence of JE and P will prove, in its way, as complete and striking as that of J and E. Gen. ii. 4 is, as I have already shown, dependently related to the account of the creation in chap. i. Not only so, but the correspondence is marked with that delicate subtlety which is the surest sign of internal unity. Chap. i. first announces the "creation" of the "heaven and the earth"; but in the subsequent "making" of things reverses the order, and, beginning with the earth, records the "making" of the earth and the heaven. This twofold order of the creation of the heaven and the earth, and the making of the earth and the heaven, which is given by P in chap. i., is recalled with significant exactitude by J in chap. ii. 4. This remarkable relation of the clauses is a subtle testimony to the validity of the proof which I have already given that the first clause of the verse, no less than the second, must be assigned to J. I have previously demonstrated the striking inter-relation of form between the introduction of the "generations of the heaven and the earth" in

chap. ii. 4, etc., and that of the "generations of Adam" in chap. v. 1, etc. In chap. v. 3, the first man, as distinguished from the woman, is called Adam; for the genealogy of that chapter is without doubt a genealogy of males. This is a P genealogy, but the application of the name Adam distinctively to the male is derived from the J account in chaps. ii., iii., iv.; for the previous P narration speaks only of a generic name Adam, applied to male and female alike. On the other hand, the generic name Adam is employed by J in chap. vi., a use of the appellation which plainly depends upon the P account of the creation of man; for in the previous J narrative, it was only the male that was so named. Further, the words of J in chap. vi. 6, 7, "It repented Jahveh that He had *made* man on the earth. . . . I will destroy man whom I have *created*," recall P's account of the "creating" and "making" of man; for J's account distinctly avoided these terms in its narrative of man's origin, and dealt specifically with the "formation" of man. Even the appellation, "sons of Elohim" (probably a technical designation), which appears in vi. 2, is made intelligible by P's representation of Seth's line as being in formal covenant with Elohim, a conception which reaches its crowning point in the record that "Enoch walked with Elohim." With this relation is also linked the employment of the name Elohim by Eve in relation to the birth of Seth (a use of

Elohim in a J section which has quite nonplussed the Higher Critics). The Jahveh ideal has been smitten by the downfall of Cain, and Eve commits her new-born child into formal covenant with Elohim: "For, said she, Elohim hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel." So wondrously are these records intertwined.

The significant statement in chap. v. 3, that while Adam had been created in the likeness of God, he begat Seth in his own likeness, distinctly implies that some change had taken place in the perfect form in which man had been created. If not, then Seth also was born in the unviolated likeness of God, a conception which would be inconsistent with P's later confession of the dire corruption of the race. The only facts, therefore, which can make the suggestion of v. 3 intelligible, are those which involve the moral downfall narrated by J in the preceding chapters. If one compares Gen. i. 27, 31, "And Elohim created man in His own image. . . . And Elohim saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was very good," with chap. vi. 11, "And the earth was corrupt before Elohim, and the earth was filled with violence," it is clear that the two conditions are altogether inconsistent with one another, unless the latter state is explained by certain intermediate processes of change. The passages quoted are both from P, but the only explanation of the change which is involved is

the account of the Fall, which has been supplied by J.

The account of the Flood in chapters vi.-viii. is triumphantly adduced by the Higher Critics as exhibiting in unmistakable characters the duality and discrepancy which, as they maintain, divide JE from P. Under exact scrutiny it will, on the contrary, show how fallacious are those methods of criticism which instigate such a claim. I will pass lightly over the fact that J's narrative in vii. 1 ff. is dependent upon the account of the building of the ark, which is supplied by P in vi. 14 ff. The Higher Critic seeks to explain away this obvious dependence by affirming that the "Compiler" omitted J's account because he preferred that of P. But this is begging the question, for the duality of the account, without mentioning the fantastic Compiler, is the very thing that has to be proved. But I will proceed to "pastures new." The general intimation given in P (vi. 18), "But I will establish my covenant with thee, and thou shalt come into the ark, etc.," needs to be followed by the more specific command to enter, which is furnished by J in vii. 1, "Come thou and all thy house into the ark." Again, God's words to Noah in this latter verse, "For thee have I seen righteous before Me in this generation," recall the characterisation of the patriarch in P (vi. 9), "Noah was a righteous man, and blameless in his generations." In viii. 3, the former portion is assigned to J, and the latter

to P, yet the sequence of the two clauses is perfect: "And the waters returned from off the earth continually, and after the end of a hundred and fifty days the waters lacked"; *i.e.* they were no longer dominant, for they failed to keep the ark afloat. If the J sentence be omitted, the sequence is greatly injured, if not altogether destroyed. In the J record, viii. 6 *ff.*, Noah is represented as sending forth a raven and a dove in order to discover if the flood had passed away. Why did he not look out himself? The explanation of his inability to do this is furnished by P's account of the construction of the window of the ark, in vi. 16: "A light shalt thou make to the ark, and to a cubit shalt thou finish it *from above*." Without P's elucidation, the narrative of J would have been unintelligible. Through this quasi-skylight the "tops of the mountains" might be seen (ver. 5), but not the lowlands beneath.

Further, the P account omits one of the most important dates of the whole series, namely, that at which the elemental disturbance came to an end. This section (in viii. 1, 2) records the advent of an assuaging wind, and the stopping of the fountains of the deep and the windows of heaven, but leaves the date of this fateful change unmentioned. It is clear that this occurred before the end of the hundred and fifty days spoken of in the previous verse; for we see from ver. 4 (also assigned to the P section) that the ark grounded

upon the mountains of Ararat in exactly five months from the beginning of the deluge (*cf.* ver. 11), and the waters must have slackened down considerably before this took place. There can be no reasonable doubt that the different terms, five months, and one hundred and fifty days, represent exactly the same period, the writer calculating thirty days to the month, according to the custom of the Egyptians. The flood must, therefore, have commenced decreasing long before the expiration of the hundred and fifty days, and the verbs in chap. viii. 1, 2 must be read as having the practical effect of pluperfects.¹

¹ This passage (Gen. vii. 18-viii. 4) furnishes a most excellent illustration of the elasticity of the Hebrew usage with regard to verbal tenses, particularly the idiomatic use of the future (or, rather, the present) tense with the so-called *vav* conversive. In a footnote on Gen. ii. 19, Dr. Driver dismisses a suggestion of certain translators with the curt pronouncement, "The rendering '*had formed*' is contrary to idiom." I have demonstrated that the intentional order of events in that chapter is not chronological, but relational; not the order of creation, but of formation and adaptation; and I have shown that, from that point of view, the order there given is perfectly accurate. There is therefore no need to insist upon the translation which Dr. Driver so summarily rules out of court. But, with all respect to Dr. Driver's Hebrew scholarship, his dictum is by no means so certain as to justify its curt peremptoriness. We have seen in the case of Wellhausen's peculiar description of "Jahveh Elohim" as "un-Hebrew," that the opinions of Hebrew scholars even on questions of Hebrew idiom are not infallible, especially when they have a pet theory to conserve. It is well known that the last word has not yet been said upon the Hebrew tenses, and that the elasticity in Hebrew is such that past, present, and future, including the past perfect and future perfect, have to be all expressed in that

Chapter viii. 1 records that God had stopped the elemental disturbance at some time before the waters were found "lacking" on Ararat at the term of one hundred and fifty days, but gives no hint as

language by two simple forms which, for the sake of convenience, are called "past" and "future" by some, and "past" and "present" by others. Under such circumstances, dictatorial judgments should be received with great caution, and the meaning of the tenses inferred by careful deduction from the sense of the narrative.

The passage I have marked out for illustration makes it clear that the Hebrew present with *vav* conversive does by no means necessarily signify chronological sequence, and that its fundamental indication is that of intimate connection and co-ordination; the chronological sequence being determined by the general sense of the narrative. In the 18th verse, the *prevailing* of the water, and the going of the ark upon the face of the water, were obviously simultaneous occurrences. In the 20th verse, it is clear that when the waters prevailed fifteen cubits upward (*i.e.* above the mountains), the mountains had already been covered, so that the verb in the second clause of the verse has the force of a pluperfect. The 21st verse can scarcely be taken as meaning that "all flesh died" *after* the waters had overtopped the mountains by fifteen cubits. At that point of time they were already dead, so that the verb here also has the force of a pluperfect.

With regard to chap. viii. 1, etc., I have already shown that the sense of the narrative forbids the supposition that the events recorded there occurred after the expiration of the hundred and fifty days, so that, as I have before said, the verbs have of necessity the practical value of pluperfects. The reader may profitably compare Gen. ii. 2, where the correct translation would plainly be, "And on the seventh day God had finished His work, etc." In the face of these facts, Dr. Driver's decree concerning the translation of even Gen. ii. 19 looks more dictatorial than can be easily justified. May I venture to say that in some instances Dr. Driver does not make sufficient allowance for the elasticities of a language so different from our own, and that some of the difficulties which he creates spring out of unwarranted rigidities of explanation and even of translation.

to the date of this most important event. This would be incomprehensible, were it not that the missing date is supplied by J, and that J and P are one. Some idea of the interval of time required for the settling of the flood from its maximum height at the ceasing of the storm to the shallow water required for the grounding of the ark may be gathered from the interval between that grounding and the first sight of the tops of the adjacent mountains; for the latter interval (*cf.* vv. 4 and 5) occupied seventy-four days.

The P section also omits to mention the time required by Noah and his sons for the long and laborious task of stocking the ark with animals and provisions, and of securing the necessary order and arrangement of the whole in preparation for their protracted confinement. It is certainly not a critical mind that would suggest that the writer of vii. 13 intended to report that all this was done, with the fountains of the deep and the windows of heaven hurriedly thrown in, in the space of one brief day. Such a preposterous notion is itself a sufficient condemnation of that disruption of the narrative upon which it depends. Clearly enough, and with perfect grammatical accuracy, the verb must be construed as a pluperfect: "In that selfsame day Noah, etc., *had* entered into the ark." This pluperfect construction is even necessary to preserve an appropriate sequence with ver. 11 (which is undisputedly by the same writer), for it is obvious that

Noah and his company would not bundle themselves into the ark after the deluge had commenced. The plain sense of ver. 13 is, that, as soon as Noah's preparations were completed, even on the very day of their completion, the flood came without delay. But for the record of the necessary days of preparation the P narrative is altogether dependent upon J.

One of those significant correspondences that strongly evidence the operations of a single mind appears in chapter viii. 15, 16: "And Elohim spake unto Noah, saying, Go forth of the ark," etc. The natural counterpart to this injunction appears in vii. 1: "And Jahveh said unto Noah, Come thou and all thy house into the ark." The correspondence is striking, yet the former is P and the latter J.

But I now come to the most remarkable demonstration of organic inter-dependence in this narrative, an example which is, in my judgment, critically conclusive and complete. The sequence which the Higher Criticism claims for the fragments of J in this record depends upon identifying the "forty days" of viii. 6 with the "forty days" of vii. 4. That is, it is suggested that the "forty days" at the end of which Noah sent forth the raven are to be reckoned from the beginning of the deluge, and have no connection with the marks of time given by P in the preceding verses. In this way the J narrative, with its measurement of forty days, is cut off

from the P section, and is forced to "gang its ain gait" e'en by itself. It is not too much to say that a serious critical examination of this position shows it to be not merely improbable, but altogether preposterous. Let my readers bear in mind that, in the J narrative, Noah was informed that the storm would last in its full force for forty days and forty nights (vii. 4), and therefore knew full well that the flood would be at its greatest height at the expiration of that term. Yet the Higher Critics suppose that, in that very hour when he knew the waters to be at their maximum, he sent forth a raven *to see if the waters were abated* ! Is this not a supreme example of lofty disregard for the common probabilities of human conduct ? Yet, in the light of this simple demonstration of the preposterousness of the foregoing assumption, the J narrative can be made intelligible in no way except by organic union with P. The sequence in viii. 5, 6 is intelligible and natural. The emergence of the tops of the mountains out of the water supplied Noah with a point of time from which to calculate the abatement, and forty days afterwards he sent out his raven. There is no other tolerable, or even intelligible, relation in which we can set the "forty days" of viii. 6. But this relation clearly interweaves it into organic union with P.

Close critical scrutiny leads us to another most important, and exceedingly striking, result. The periods chosen by Noah for the sending forth of his winged messengers were obviously suggested to him

by the two intervals mentioned in connection with the advent of the flood, namely, the forty days of rain and the seven days of preparation. The numbers had become consecrated to him, and God's numbers for the beginnings of the flood became Noah's numbers for its latter stages. This fact enables us to measure with exactitude the number of days which J gives as having elapsed between the P dates in viii. 5 and 13. The first interval is definitely stated to be forty days (viii. 6). The second interval (v. 8) is also in all probability intended to be read as "ditto," seeing that no change of measurement is given. And the two "forties" exactly balance the two "sevens" which follow. If a change had been intended from "forty" to "seven" in the second interval, the indication would not have been omitted at that emphatic point, seeing that it is minutely noted in subsequent intervals. The words, "He stayed yet other seven days" (viii. 10), must, therefore, be freely interpreted as meaning, "He stayed yet another term of days, namely, seven." The more rigid interpretation would require the previous specific mention of a seven days' term.

We can now sum up the total of the various terms. Two terms of forty days each, and two of seven days each, make a total of ninety-four days. But, on the last day of the second term of seven, Noah would, of course, wait the whole day, as in the previous case, for the dove's return. As the dove did not return at all, Noah on the following morning,

that is, on the eighth day, ventured to look out upon the world. By the necessary addition of this one day, the total number of days becomes ninety-five.

Now, if the JEP narrative is an organic unity, these J numbers take their starting-point from viii. 5, where P records the visibility of the tops of the mountains, and reach their terminus in ver. 13, in which P gives the date when the waters were dried up from the earth. I have already shown that the interval given between the seventeenth day of the second month (vii. 11) and the seventeenth day of the seventh month (viii. 4), *i.e.* exactly five months, is one hundred and fifty days. The months are, therefore, plainly reckoned on the plan of the months of the common Egyptian year, namely, at thirty days per month. The tops of the mountains were seen on the first day of the tenth month, and the "waters were dried up from off the earth" on the first day of the first month of the following year; *i.e.* the interval exactly measured three months, which, at thirty days a month, makes a total of ninety days. But we know that the common Egyptian year contained three hundred and sixty-five days, while twelve months of thirty days each amounted only to three hundred and sixty days. To make up the difference, five intercalary days were added at the close of the year before proceeding to reckon the first day of the next year. As our record takes us to the first day of the new year, these five

days must be added to the previous ninety, and so we again obtain the grand total of ninety-five days.

The fact that this striking correspondence is not on the surface, but is hidden in the inward fibre of the narrative, makes it the more conclusive. I hold that it is impossible to conceive a more complete demonstration of vital unity underlying the peculiar manners and methods of an ancient Oriental writing. I have shown that the dates and numbers of J and P are not independent, but organically interlaced and connected, and that they are inwrought in subtle harmonies which can be born only of true organic unity.

So complete and conclusive is the foregoing demonstration, and so crucial is the instance, that I might justly bring this part of my argument to an end with it, and fairly regard the further prosecution of this line of evidence as mere detail. To prove organic unity in one crucial case is to prove it for all cases. But, as a concession to the "infirmity of (some) noble minds," I will pursue this demonstration a little further. In chap. xvi. (assigned to JE) the chief of the patriarchs and his wife are invariably called Abram and Sarai. In the next JE section (chapter xviii.) they are named with equal consistency Abraham and Sarah. Such a change of names is treated in all sections of the Pentateuch as a very important matter, yet the JE narrative supplies no explanation of this abrupt and startling

alteration. The change is made intelligible only by the P narrative in chapter xvii., on which, therefore, JE is plainly dependent.

The Higher Critics have paid some attention to the singular P paragraph in chap. xix. 29, but their pursuit of a mistaken theory has blinded them to the most remarkable and suggestive feature of the verse. It makes the peculiar assertion that "Elohim remembered *Abraham*, and sent *Lot* out of the midst of the overthrow." If it were recorded that Elohim remembered Abraham, and saved him, or that Elohim remembered Lot, and saved him, the meaning would be clear and natural. But the circumlocutory declaration that God saved Lot because He remembered Abraham, evidently requires the knowledge of some special history behind it for its elucidation. This need is strengthened by the fact that the words "Elohim remembered" carry with them in the Pentateuch the implication of a previous compact between God and those whom He "remembers." (*Cf.* viii. 1, "And God remembered Noah, etc.") Now, there is nothing in the P sections of the Pentateuch to make this singular connection of events intelligible, but the JE narrative of chap. xviii. supplies precisely the facts required to make the riddle plain. There Abraham definitely stands between God and any righteous men who may be found in the doomed cities; and from that intercession it becomes clear how God saved Lot, because He

remembered Abraham. The P paragraph (xix. 29) is, therefore, organically related to, and dependent upon, the JE narrative of chap. xviii.

Let my readers, as a closing example, compare Gen. xlviii. 7 (P) with chap. xxxv. 16, 19 (JE). This so-called P account of Jacob's utterance depends upon, and recalls, the JE record of Rachel's death, even to the extent of verbal repetition of some of the phrases employed in the narrative. Note the phrases, "when there was still some way to come unto Ephrath"; "and I buried her there in the way to Ephrath"; and compare, "and there was still some way to come to Ephrath"; "and Rachel died, and was buried in the way to Ephrath." Is it possible, with any semblance of critical method, to maintain that these passages belong to independent and unrelated documents? My judgment is an absolute negative, and I confidently appeal to the critical sense of my readers.

The organic inter-ramifications of JE and P in Genesis having been sufficiently demonstrated, I turn for a moment to an interesting view of their unity from another standpoint. It is well known that the P section contains no reference to altars or sacrifices until after the formally complete revelation of Jahveh in Exodus vi. 2 ff. Yet it is a cardinal assumption of the Higher Criticism that the P document was written by priests for the express purpose of glorifying the priesthood and its functions, among which the offering of sacrifices

was cardinal and supreme. With such a purpose, it would have been the first requirement to create an impressive historical preparation for the final system of Levitical sacrifices, so as to give them the sanction of high antiquity combined with spiritual necessity. If it is contended that the priestly writers did not realise the importance of this elementary postulate, and wished to represent religious observance as beginning with the Levitical Legislation, then the P writings themselves flatly contradict the contention; for they carry back to remote historical beginnings some important anticipations of the Levitical code. The law of the Sabbath is already shadowed forth in God's resting upon the seventh day, as recorded in Gen. i. The Levitical law against eating the flesh with the blood is anticipated in the P writing in Gen. ix. 4. And the law of circumcision is traced to its beginnings in Gen. xvii. 10 *ff*. Is it credible that a writer, who sought sanctions for the law of the Sabbath, the law against blood, and the law of circumcision, in earlier historical relations of men to God, would have been indifferent respecting historical sanctions for the central law of sacrifices? Would he have taken pains to indicate to his readers that sacrificial offerings were of comparatively recent date, and had no sanction in the impressive religious history of the patriarchs? The improbability is extreme. Yet the historical preparation for the great law of Levitical sacrifices

(P), as well as for that of the division of birds and beasts into clean and unclean (also P), is furnished by JE, and by JE only. Thus, from this new point of view, the organic unity of JEP is again clearly evidenced. To crown all, the bursting forth of P, in Exodus vi. 2, into the full bloom of the Jahveh consciousness, loses nearly all its beauty and significance if it is torn from its organic relation with the gradual growth of the knowledge of Jahveh which is developed in such charming pictures in the JE writings of Genesis. This triumphant *formal* adoption of the Jahveh conception marks the maturity of the struggling processes of growth, elucidates all previous differences, and gathers them up into the ripened harmony of a single bloom. To miss seeing this remarkable unity is not only to misunderstand the Pentateuch, but also to fail to apprehend a wonderful conception divinely executed, a "beauty and a joy for ever."

Dr. Driver does not pretend to say that the P narrative, as it appears in the Pentateuch, could possibly stand alone. He has perforce to admit that it is broken by many gaps and omissions, and I have in this present volume pointed out many broken ends which he does not appear to have observed. In fine, the idea that P can be regarded in Genesis as an independent history will not bear the strain of critical consideration. It is largely a bare catalogue of genealogies, with

a few very formal transactions sprinkled among them. It does not furnish even the "straight line" history beloved by the Higher Critics; it is but the fragments of a skeleton. For its flesh and blood and vital articulation it depends upon JE. Dr. Driver labours heavily with his apologetic in this connection:—

"His (P's) aim is to give a *systematic* view, from a priestly standpoint, of the origin and chief institutions of the Israelitish theocracy. For this purpose, an *abstract* of the history is sufficient: to judge from the parts that remain, the narrative of the patriarchal age, even when complete, cannot have been more than a bare outline."

Anything weaker or more inconsequent than this defence would scarcely be possible, yet it is the best that can be offered. Is a genealogy an *abstract* of *history*? Can it, in and by itself, be properly called a history at all? Why should an "abstract" of history be deemed sufficient for such a considerable purpose as "to give a systematic view . . . of the origin and chief institutions of the Israelitish theocracy?" This purpose is sufficiently concrete and comprehensive. By what critical law is the prosecution of this purpose to be restricted to an "abstract of history"? Such assertions are not criticism, but random suggestions snatched at in the hope of saving the critic's theory.

But the P writer is unkind to the Higher Critic even here also. According to some recondite law

which Dr. Driver has discovered, he ought to have confined himself to writing an "abstract" of history. But, unfortunately for this mysterious law, Dr. Driver has to admit that the P writing in Genesis sometimes "becomes detailed." For this difficulty some explanation must, of course, be excogitated, and Dr. Driver excogitates as follows: "It (P's narrative in Genesis) only becomes detailed at important epochs, or where the origin of some existing institution has to be explained."

This sounds very well until you discover that it is incorrect or irrelevant. If the critic be correct in asserting that the form of P's narrative is determined by his purpose as above stated, then the "important epochs" for P are those, and those only, that are important in reference to that purpose. The account of the institution of the rite of circumcision (chap. xviii.) may be freely admitted to bear that character. Dr. Driver appeals also to chap. ix., and his appeal may be admitted in part; yet the greater part of P's writing in that section is of too universal a scope to have any important bearing upon "the origin and chief institutions of the Israelitish theocracy." P's account of the creation in Gen. i. is splendidly "detailed," but its bearing upon the Israelitish theocracy is somewhat remote, save in the closing verses, which hint at the universal ground of the Sabbath observance. The account in P (chap. xxiii.) of the purchase by Abraham of the Cave of Machpelah is detailed, and even picturesque. The human interest

of the narration is very great, and it is also important from the general standpoint of the Genesis record of the patriarchal hopes and aspirations, but it needs an abnormal imagination to exalt it to special consequence in reference to the furnishing of a "systematic view . . . of the origin and chief institutions of the Israelitish theocracy!" These institutions did not include an annual pilgrimage to the Cave of Machpelah.

In fine, P is unintelligible except as part of a larger whole. I have shown that, taken apart from the general history to which it belongs, it is but a heap of broken fragments, unequal and inconsistent, quite inadequate to present a history of the times, and unable to produce from itself alone any satisfactory principle of unity. I have demonstrated, on the other hand, how vitally it is interwoven with the other portions of the history in Genesis. This vital inter-dependence of JE and P leads us to the same result as in previous chapters: the narrative JEP is one.

IX

THE PLAN OF THE PENTATEUCH

WE have now reached a suitable point for a general view of the actual manner in which the principal sections of the Pentateuch in Genesis are articulated into organic unity. In order to relate my demonstrations unmistakably with the conclusions of the Higher Criticism, I have denoted the two main elements by the symbols JE and P. Yet, because these symbols are the particular labels of false hypotheses, they are inadequate, and even misleading, in respect of the present argument. In our investigation, discrepancies and independencies have steadily disappeared, bringing us to the sure conclusion of diversity in unity. That the diversity which enters into the organic unity is striking, and even remarkable, is not for a moment disputed; for the composition of the Pentateuch, like all the rest of the sacred Scriptures, is truly wonderful, and the wonder grows with the progress of rightly directed investigation. If we find in the Pentateuch itself that the writing pursues a certain plan, or fulfils a certain achievement, no matter how wonderful, the facts must not be discredited by any *a priori* theories of what the

writer might or could have done. The present matter, as much as anything in the world, must conform to the principle — "*Solvitur in ambulando.*"

After dissipating the conjectures of the Higher Criticism, we have seen that the Pentateuch is marked by two elements which show considerable diversity from one another; and we have been able to define this variancy in reference to a distinct and definite principle, and that comprehensively and completely. For I have demonstrated that the so-called P writings are simply distinguished by their being couched in what is known as the *formal* style of composition, while the remainder of the work is written in what may, in contradistinction, be called the *informal* or ordinary style. I have already pointed out that a diversity thus characterised does not by any means evidence duality of authorship, but, on the contrary, suggests the varied related operations of a single hand. History has its formal and informal sides and features, and a truly complete history will include both; but a history that gave us nothing but the former would be a freak indeed. In fact, I have already demonstrated the organic interdependence of these two sides of the Pentateuchal history, and what now remains is to trace out, through the actual construction of the Pentateuch itself, the scheme of unity into which these diverse, but related, elements are cast. One might divine even before-hand that, in such a unity, the formal

portions would be composed as a kind of general framework for the freer and less restrained details of historical narration, sometimes serving as a general introduction to the narration of particular events, sometimes formally summing up the general result of a previously detailed record, and generally contributing the more bare and formal genealogies and the more formal covenants and transactions. Such a comprehensive scheme of history would be worthy of a great designer. Are we to judge *a priori* that the writer of the Pentateuch was incapable of such breadth of conception? Is it true criticism to refuse to allow him credit for capacity to draw anything more complicated than a straight line? I trow not. In the "volume of the book" we shall find that this remarkable scheme has been actually fulfilled.

Gen. i.-ii. 3 constitutes a formal introduction to the whole history of the Pentateuch, ending with the formal or general record of the creation of man. From this point the particular account of the first members of the human family is taken up, until the birth of Seth. This has prepared the way for the formal genealogy of Seth, which (chap. v.) bridges over an historically unimportant period, and terminates with the history-making names of Noah and his three sons. At this point the freer narration records the causes and processes of man's corruption upon the earth, and the end of Divine forbearance with human sin. This prepares the way for the

formal covenant with Noah, and the general arrangement for the preservation of men and animals in the ark (Gen. vi. 9-22). From this point the narrative takes up the more particular injunctions given by God to Noah, adding to the general arrangement of the preservation of pairs the particular provision that of clean beasts and fowls the pairs shall be in sevens; and furnishing particulars concerning the time and the duration of the flood. In chap. vii. the writer has naturally intertwined the account of the fulfilment both of the general and the particular arrangement which God had made with Noah. In chap. viii. 5, a formal note is made of the date when the tops of the mountains were seen. This opens the way for the particular narrative of the sending forth of the raven and the dove, which in its turn is succeeded by the formal notification of the date when these experiments came to an end. In chap. viii. 15-19, God formally terminates the period of the flood, and makes a general covenant with Noah and the animal world. This opens the way for the narrative of Noah's spontaneous response in sacrifice, and God's pleasure in his offering. Out of this now springs the important formal covenant of chap. ix. 1-17, in which God establishes the sanctity of human life, the dominion of man over the lower animals, and the general security of men and animals from another deluge. Chap. ix. 18, 19 gives a brief formal genealogy of Noah, which prepares the way for the narrative in which the destinies of Shem, Ham, and Japheth are

decided. This is then rounded by a formal register of Noah's death.

In Gen. x. the writer gives a brief description of the genealogies of the three sons of Noah, summarising as much as possible, so as to clear the ground quickly to pay special attention to Shem. It is unnecessary to trace the course of the chapter minutely; but the usual features occur, formal notifications succeeded by more particular descriptions, which are rounded off and completed in their turn by formal periods. The formal closing of these genealogies in chap. x. 32 sets the writer forward on the particular history of the growing world of men and of their distribution over the face of the earth (chap. xi. 1-9). In this divided world the writer now singles out for his purpose the line of Shem, and formally records its genealogy (xi. 10-26). The genealogy given by him in chap. x. 21-30 is for the most part informal, and inserted in union with that of Japheth and Ham, in order to give a complete view of the descent from Noah and of the general peopling of the world. In the eleventh chapter both the purpose and the form of Shem's genealogy are different. It is now selected as the specific line along which the narrative is to find that history of Divine grace which it is its purpose to record. It is set forth with distinctive formality, searching for its end in Terah and Abram.

In chap. xi. 27-32, we have another example of the skilful and effective way in which the formal and

informal elements are interwoven, the whole paragraph being introduced by one formal passage and rounded off by another. The formal statement of the migration of Terah and his death at Harran introduces the personal history of Abram, who now emerges into clear relief as the moving cause of the migration and the chosen friend of God. After the particular communication from God (chap. xii. 1-4), a formal notification is made of the fulfilment by Abraham of the command to go into Canaan (chap. xii. 4, 5).

In chap. xiii. 11, 13 ("and they . . . cities of the plain") another formal notification is given, this time of the separation of Lot from Abram. This formal notice is preceded by a detailed narrative of all the circumstances which led to it, and in its turn introduces the account of an emphatic renewal of the Divine blessing to the now isolated Abram. From this point the narrative proceeds some way without these marks of formal stages, the fourteenth chapter narrating the rescue of Lot, and the fifteenth describing a vision from God, with renewed promises. But the sixteenth chapter gives some interesting illustrations of the interweaving of this formal element. The first sentence formally announces the childlessness of Sarai. Out of this springs Sarai's project concerning Hagar. In the third verse the transaction of handing Hagar over to Abram is formally completed. This introduces the detailed narrative of Hagar's conception, her flight

from her mistress, and her return. The account is then formally closed by the announcement of the birth and naming of the child.

Events, promises, and visions have been steadily leading up to a certain conclusion, and this conclusion now reaches its complete or formal stage in the seventeenth chapter, in which they are finally ratified and sealed in a covenant drawn out with precise and technical elaboration. This formal covenant is contracted in the name of El Shaddai, and not simply in the general name of Elohim, and thus definitely marks a stage in the progress towards the *formal* knowledge of Jahveh, which is the goal towards which the whole of Genesis is striving. The line of the blessing is fixed definitely through Sarai, in the son whom she is now to conceive. Ishmael's destiny is also formally ratified, and the whole sealed by the formal token of circumcision.

This covenant is pivotal, and uplifts into clear relief the splendid unity in which the writer unfolds his strikingly complex conception of history.

After this remarkable covenant the detailed narrative rolls upward into a higher plane. The personal Deity, with angels, visits with familiar presence the tent of Abraham, and converses familiarly with Sarah as well as with the patriarch concerning the son that is to be born, giving special attention to the confirmation of Sarah's faith in preparation for the Divine favour which she was about to receive. Abraham recedes into the background in this narrative, and Sarah occupies the foreground, because Abraham

had already been assured with all the solemnities of a formal covenant. Abraham is then honoured with the Divine communication and concession concerning Sodom and Gomorrah ; and the narrative proceeds to detail the particulars of the destruction of the cities and the deliverance of Lot. Then, in chap. xix. 29, the narrator, in accordance with this general scheme, crystallises the general effect and result of this narrative in a brief, but suggestive, formal summary: "And so it came to pass, when Elohim destroyed the cities of the Plain, that Elohim remembered Abraham, and sent Lot out of the midst of the overthrow, when He overthrew the cities in which Lot dwelt."

The narrative of the destruction having been thus formally closed, the flow of events moves onward without the aid of formal endorsements until the end of the twentieth chapter. At the beginning of chapter xxi. the formal notification of the birth, naming, and circumcision of Isaac introduces a new stage in the course of events. The first two verses of the chapter will illustrate the writer's method of leading up to a point in which events can be rounded off and fixed in a formal conclusion. If the analysis of the Higher Critics is correct, verse 1*a* finds its formal completion in verse 1*b*, and verse 2*a* introduces the formal mark of time in verse 2*b*. But the assignment of verse 1*b* to the formal style is probably wrong. The indications point the other way. The brief sentence has no decisive marks of formal phraseology ; it appears to refer to a personal

promise to Sarah rather than to Abraham, and it contains the name Jahveh, which is not the appropriate name to be associated with a formal covenant. In verses 1-2*a*, therefore, the narrator leads the way in his freer manner to the formal notification of the time fixed by the covenant in verse 2*b*, and the formal fulfilment of the terms of the covenant in verses 3-5. The formal record of the birth and dedication of Isaac introduces the detailed narrations of Sarah's maternal joys and jealousies, the vicissitudes of the lot of Hagar and Ishmael, the advance of Abraham in power and influence, the ordeal in which Isaac was ("in a figure") sacrificed and restored, and the happy tidings of fruitfulness and prosperity in the collateral line of his brother Nahor, foretokening the source from which Isaac should be happily provided with a wife according to his father's wishes. The anticipatory gleam of the coming marriage for Isaac crosses the shadow of the grave for Sarah, and the twenty-third chapter records in the formal style with which we are now familiar the register of her death and the technical business transactions concerning the purchase of a grave for her from the inhabitants of the land, who are always called in these formal sections the children of Heth. There are some exquisite old-world courtesies in this chapter, but it is essentially a formal business transaction, and is therefore couched in formal phraseology. From this formal record of the death and burial of Sarah, the narrative strikes out into

the picturesque history of the arrangements employed to bring Isaac a wife out of Nahor's family. This having been accomplished, the career of Abraham is formally closed in the writer's usual manner, in chap. xxv. 1-11. Before proceeding further, he formally sums up and closes the record of Ishmael, Abraham's son. This clears the way for pursuing the history of Isaac, and, with a formal register of his birth, and of his age when he married, as previously related, we are fully launched upon the history of Isaac after his father's death. The formal description of "Bethuel, the Syrian, of Padan-Aram, etc.," is specially noticeable, and reminds one strongly of the style of a legal document, or an official register. Then the narrative strides out freely, with the exception of a formal register of Isaac's age (chap. xxv. 26*b*) until we come to chap. xxvi. 34, 35. In these verses a formal register of the marriage of Esau with daughters of the Canaanites introduces the detailed history of his rejection in favour of Jacob; for in this he had committed an offence against the cherished ideals of the patriarchs, as shown in Abraham's anxious choice of a wife for Isaac. The history then develops until Jacob is in danger of his life from Esau's resentment, and his mother becomes anxious for his safety. This particular stage of affairs reaches its termination in the formal representation of Rebekah to Isaac that the time has now come for Jacob to seek a wife from the approved source from which Isaac had been suitably wedded. This is

followed by the formal blessing of the covenant upon Jacob before he departs, and a formal register of Esau's new blunder in seeking to make amends for his violation of the family law of marriage. This general statement prepares us for the history of Jacob's journeyings and of his marriage with Leah and Rachel, and also for the growth of Esau's household and effects which made him so formidable to his brother when the latter was wending his way back homeward. There are possibly three or four brief formal sentences in chapters xxix., xxxi., xxxiii., but the narrative runs on without any formal markings of importance until the thirty-fourth chapter. This chapter is an excellent illustration and demonstration of the interlacing of this formal function with the informal narrative. The formal and the other portions are there so essentially one that by no device can they be separated. The outrage upon Dinah is narrated in the *informal* portion only, the early formal portions (xxxiv. 1-2a, 4, 6, 8-10) only relating the desire of Shechem and his father for the former's wedded union with Dinah, and for general inter-marriage. Yet it is in the *formal* portion that the scheme is laid for vengeance. This scheme, made as a formal declaration to Hamor (verses 13-18), introduces the informal outburst of the 19th verse; and this verse cannot be attached to anything in the wide realm of space but to the preceding formal proposition. Dr. Driver is greatly puzzled by this chapter, and no wonder; for he rejects the

only possible solution, which is, that the formal and informal sides of the narrative are in organic unity.¹ A detailed examination of the remainder of Genesis is unnecessary, for it is on the same principle of relation that the formal and informal presentations of the history are woven together throughout. The final stage in the discrimination of the Divine names is reached in the formal covenant of Exodus vi. 2-7. This has been preceded by the usual preparatory stage, for the formal crystallisation is always preceded by the less formal process of development. This latter reaches its last stage in Exodus iii. 1-16, where God explains to Moses the connotation of His name Jahveh. In chap. vi. this revelation is completed and crowned by the *formal adoption* of the name Jahveh as the covenant name which is henceforth to take the place of El Shaddai. Dr. Driver affirms that the latter passage does not describe the sequel of the former, but is parallel to it. I have sufficiently demonstrated that this is incorrect, and that the sequence is perfectly natural and profoundly significant. Most of the "parallels" of the Higher Critics vanish in the same way, and are converted into pregnant sequences, by simple attention to the structure of the book and the manifested plan of the author. It may be that some *a priori* critic will object that

¹ I would ask my readers to make a special examination of this narrative, Gen. xxxiv., as its features are sufficient by themselves to prove the organic unity of JE and P. Note particularly the incidental and retrospective reference of ver. 13b (P) to the narration of ver. 2b (J) and 5a (J).

the scheme which I have outlined is too subtle and intricate to be ascribed to an ancient writer even of an inspired writing. But it is illegitimate to deny the facts which the writing itself illustrates on the speculative ground that they are too wonderful. If the book be of God, we cannot be surprised at any marvel which its construction discloses. I appeal to the book; I have set in order the facts; and I confidently put it to those who read these evidences that these things are so. Even if we leave inspiration out of account, it is a violation of the law of criticism to refuse to admit the demonstrated feature of the employment in an antique Oriental work of literary methods which may be altogether remote from our present ideas. Facts, however strange, must vanquish fiction, however plausible.

I have shown that, from the beginning of Genesis to the sixth chapter of Exodus, the distinction between the formal and informal sections of the narrative has closely corresponded with a striking discrimination in the employment of the names Jahveh (or Jahveh Elohim) and Elohim simply and absolutely. In the informal parts Jahveh and Elohim are variously entwined, but with a constant tendency Jahveh-wards. In the formal portion the name Jahveh is virtually excluded. It appears once (Gen. xvii. 1) in the *introduction* to a formal covenant, but not in the course of the covenant itself; a most natural occurrence in the operations of organic unity, but utterly inexplicable on the

theory of "single name" documents. The assignment of Gen. xxi. 1b to the formal section is very doubtful. But, if it is correct, the name Jahveh might easily have been attracted to that clause by the fact that the gracious intercourse of Jahveh with Sarah had followed upon the formal covenant of Elohim with Abraham. Such is the naturalness with which all the parts flow into appropriate relations when their organic unity is recognised. The Compilation Theory, on the other hand, must perforce resort to the desperate expedient of mutilating the sacred text. With the exception of what I may call these "organic" Jahvehs on its fringe, the formal portion, recognising the knowledge of Jahveh as an ideal not yet formally reached, employs only those designations of Deity which are suitable to the formal standpoint. The name Jahveh is associated with the vital particulars of informal progress; the general and universal relations of God to men and things are presented in reference to the general name of Elohim. The first formal covenants are recorded in this name; but later covenants with the patriarchs are sealed in the special name of El Shaddai, and mark a distinct advance towards the goal of the *formal* knowledge of Jahveh. In Exodus vi. this goal is at length reached, and the exclusion of the name Jahveh from the formal covenants with Israel is no longer maintained. But we should naturally expect the writer to continue to work out the same fruitful

conception of history, and to interweave the formal and informal elements as before. We should also expect a continued discrimination between the names Jahveh and Elohim, though in a modified way and with less frequency. In cases, for example, in which the author regards the reference to God as being of a more general kind, the general name Elohim would still be appropriately used in preference to Jahveh.

In the sequel to Exodus vi. this expectation is precisely fulfilled. The name Elohim is prominently employed in Exodus xviii., and an examination of the chapter leaves no doubt as to the discriminative design of the writer. The high priest of Midian occupies a prominent place in that portion of the narrative, and the reference to the Deity therefore assumes a more general standpoint. Even Kuenen is compelled to admit the discriminative use of Elohim in cases analogous to this, so I need not labour it.

Exodus xiii. 17-19 contains one of the most noticeable instances of the use of Elohim subsequently to the formal proclamation of the name Jahveh in Exodus vi. The appropriateness of the term in this definitely marked paragraph can be both felt and understood. The verses have a distinctly general cast, and sum up certain salient circumstances from a general standpoint. The introduction of Pharaoh and the Philistines into this general cast still further generalises the reference to Deity as the omnipotent Disposer of the fortunes of Egypt and Philistia no less than

of the history of the children of Israel. It is important for my readers to remember that the occurrence of Elohim in these verses is an insoluble puzzle for the Compilation Theory. Even on the hypothesis of the Higher Critics themselves, there is no pretext for the assumption of "single name" documents after the announcement of the name Jahveh in Exodus iii. and vi. In such passages as the one we have been dealing with, they must stultify their whole position by taking refuge in a psychological explanation, or they must illogically conjure with "single name" documents after the only possible excuse for such a phenomenon has been conspicuously blotted out.¹ The same canon obviously applies to every occurrence of the name Elohim after the pronouncement of Exodus vi. Thus the Compilation Theory of "single name" histories finally disappears, and only the fruitful principle of psychological discrimination remains.

¹ The strange lapses of the Higher Critics from the plainest requirements of critical consistency find an interesting illustration in Dr. Driver's naïve comments on this passage. He assigns Exodus xiii. 17-19 to E, and remarks in justification of this assignment, "In xiii. 17-19 notice Elohim (not Jahveh) four times." Yet, according to Dr. Driver's own analysis, it was this very same writer E that narrated, in Exodus iii. 14-16, the solemn substitution of the name Jahveh for that of Elohim! In the name of common-sense, let alone criticism, would not that writer be likely to employ the name Jahveh, rather than Elohim, ever afterwards? And if he should by any chance employ the name Elohim, would it not be necessary to try to discover some particular reason for his doing so? Dr. Driver and his friends have, in these cases, forgotten the original pit out of which their Theory was dug, and turn criticism into confusion.

I have now shown by actual demonstration that the formal and informal sections of Genesis are combined in intimate and fundamental unity. Dr. Driver admits a modified unity, a symmetrical plan by which the book of Genesis systematically narrows its range from point to point, in order at length to trace the specific history of the children of Israel. Yet he labours to ascribe to the P section all the credit for this construction. He labours in vain; the plan embraces all sections of the book. The scheme of creation terminates in the general creation of man (P). The general creation introduces the "generations of the heaven and the earth," which includes the formation of Adam and Eve, the birth and history of Cain and Abel, and the birth of Seth (JE). By the selective plan of the book, Seth is then selected, and his genealogy given (P). The two branches then flow together, and the world is destroyed, with the exception of Noah and his family (JE and P). Then the history of Noah is given, and the genealogy of his three sons, with a general sketch of the peopling of the world (JE and P). Now Shem is singled out, and his genealogy formally and minutely given (P).

It is unnecessary to pursue the scheme further, as my readers can easily discern the same consistent plan down to the end of the book. That even such unity of arrangement as this could be evolved out of independent and discrepant documents is

highly improbable; that it would or could have been accomplished by a series of "Compilers," who lacked the requisite literary sense to detect the most glaring discrepancies, is entirely impossible. But the unity which I have exhibited as existing between the formal and informal constituents of the history is far deeper and more essential, and cannot by any means be reconciled with independency and variancy, let alone discrepancy, of authorship.

It must by this time be clear to my readers that the relation which I have proved to exist between the formal and informal sections of the Genesis narrative disposes at one sweep of most of the "parallel" passages and "duplicate" accounts regarding which the Higher Critics have made so much ado. The supposed duplicate narratives of the creation, the flood, the final announcement of the name Jahveh, and other similar cases, have revealed themselves as striking and emphatic sequences. Our demonstrations have virtually covered all the cases; but, as there are a few special instances accentuated by the Higher Critics, we will deal briefly with those examples before we pass on. In addition to the "duplicates" which have already been dissipated in the process of our argument, Kuenen mentions the following. He declares that there are "two accounts of the origin of the name Beersheba (Gen. xxi. 31 and xxvi. 32, 33); of the name Bethel (Gen. xxviii. 10-19

and xxxv. 15); of the name Israel (Gen. xxxii. 24-32 and xxxv. 10); of the names of Esau's wives (Gen. xxvi. 34, xxviii. 9, and xxxvi. 2, 3); of Esau's settlement in Seir, which took place, according to Gen. xxxii. 4 *seq.*, xxxiii. 1 *seq.*, during Jacob's sojourn in Mesopotamia; and, according to Gen. xxxvi. 6, 7, after his return thence."

Dr. Driver adds to these an instance which so strongly betrays the singular methods of the Higher Criticism, that I raise it last in order to dismiss it first. He writes, "In Gen. xvii. 16-19 and xviii. 10-14 the promise of a son to Sarah is twice described, with an accompanying double explanation of the name Isaac." Even this does not satisfy this critic, for he adds in a footnote, "There is a third explanation, from a third source, in xxi. 6."

If one had not made acquaintance with the frequent recklessness of the Higher Criticism, it would have been amazing to find that this detailed statement of Dr. Driver's has absolutely no foundation in fact. The explanation of the bestowment of the name Isaac is given in Gen. xvii. 17-19, and the matter of the naming of the child is not mentioned at all in either of the other two passages to which Dr. Driver refers us. It is a mere phantasy of the critic's mind, compounded of the circumstance that laughter is mentioned in these passages, and that the name Isaac means laughter. Would such unregulated conjecture be allowed in any criticism under the sun except Biblical criticism?

The difficulty respecting the name Beersheba is created simply by the "straight line" theory of history which the Higher Critics have laid down for themselves and others. Their favourite axiom is that history shall never repeat itself, an axiom as unbeautiful as it is false. In unsettled days, when nomenclature was in a fluid state, the endorsement and confirmation of a name by a second series of significant events would tend to give it a fixity not otherwise attainable. For this purpose, no less than for sentimental reasons, Isaac desired to resuscitate and establish the names which his father had bestowed (*vide* Gen. xxvi. 18). The case of Beersheba is an example of this sensible policy.

With respect to the name Bethel, the second instance belongs to the *formal* section, and simply illustrates the plan of the Pentateuch by which an informal process or event is carried up to formal endorsement and completion.

The bestowment of the name Israel follows a similar process, being informally conferred in Gen. xxxii. and formally sealed in Gen. xxxv. This view is completely established by the fact that, although the name is first awarded to Jacob in xxxii. 28, he is not afterwards called Israel in any section of the narrative until God has formally ratified the bestowment of the name in xxxv. 10. After that event, however, he is frequently styled Israel, not only in the formal section, but in all sections, of the history. The conclusion is obvious.

THE PLAN OF THE PENTATEUCH 191

With regard to the two accounts of the names of Esau's wives, they do not support the case for the Higher Critics, for these latter, albeit with many wriggings, must virtually admit that the apparently discrepant passages all belong alike to the formal section (the P document of the critics), and require, therefore, to be harmonised by them as much as by anybody else. The painful effort of the critics to detach a portion of these verses from P is exemplified in the following remarks of Dr. Driver:—

“The history of Esau (Gen. xxxvi.) belongs to P (in the main).” The bracketed words are explained in a footnote: “For it is generally allowed” (that is, of course, by the Higher Critics) “vv. 2-5 (though even here the framework appears to be that of P) include an element foreign to P: in particular, the names of Esau's wives differ from those given in xxvi. 34 *f.*, xxviii. 9 (both P), and must thus have been derived, most probably by the Compiler, from a different source.”

It would be difficult to find a more vicious circle than that in which the foregoing words gyrate, the whole proceeding on the uncritical assumption that a homogeneous ancient history must not contain passages difficult to harmonise. Were it not for the appearance of discrepancy, Gen. xxxvi. 2, 3 would have been unhesitatingly assigned to the P section, and it must be so assigned still. It is generally a desperate case when the mysterious

Compiler has to be summoned to bear the critics' burdens. The case of Esau's wives is, therefore, just one of those ordinary difficulties of an antique document which prove nothing in particular, and can be examined at leisure.

The remaining case of Esau's settlement in Seir is very simple. In Gen. xxxii. and xxxiii. we find that Esau was already resident in Seir when Jacob drew near home on his return from Padan-Aram. The JE section of the history supplies no explanation of this; and, as an explanation was needed (seeing that Esau was at home with Isaac when Jacob left home), the explanation is formally given in Gen. xxxvi. 6-8. Keil has pointed out that these verses do not mean that Esau waited until Jacob's return; but that Esau retired to Seir in anticipation of his brother's home-coming. Dr. Driver's reply is the brief comment (in a footnote): "Keil's explanation of this discrepancy is insufficient." It would be interesting to know why Dr. Driver deems it insufficient. The only reason I can think of is, that, in spite of his Hebrew scholarship, he does not sufficiently allow for the natural elasticities of the Hebrew tongue. The following is a perfectly correct and natural translation of the passage in question: "And Esau took his wives, and his sons, and his daughters, and all the souls of his house, and his cattle, and all his beasts, and all his possessions, which he had gathered in the land of Canaan; and went to a land to avoid

Jacob his brother; for their substance was too great for dwelling together; and the land of their sojournings would not have been able to bear them owing to the number of their cattle." That is simple enough. Just as Jacob had been able to obtain intelligence of Esau's removal to Seir, and had consequently sent his messengers directly thither; so Esau had previously received the information that Jacob, now a wealthy man, had started on his journey home from Padan-Aram. Perceiving that the ancestral lands would not hold their combined possessions on Jacob's arrival, he retired in Jacob's favour, and made good his possession of Edom before his brother appeared on the scene. Of this retirement tidings had evidently been conveyed to Jacob on the march, and the movement no doubt stimulated his fears.

All this is simple, natural, and plain. As to the translation which I have given, a few words will place it beyond dispute. The crucial point in it is the translation of the words "*mippene Jahcob*" by the phrase, "to avoid Jacob." The surest way to establish the meaning of a phrase is by comparison. In Gen. iii. 8, the words, "And the man and his wife hid themselves *mippene Jahveh Elohim*," clearly means that they hid themselves "to avoid Jahveh Elohim." When they knew that He was coming, they went into hiding. In Gen. vii. 7, we read, "And Noah went in . . . into the ark *mippene me hamabul*"; which

indisputably means that he went into the ark "to avoid the waters of the flood." It was not after the flood had commenced that he went into the ark; he went in because he had received intimation that the flood was coming. Such cases as these render it impossible for any Hebrew scholar to deny the naturalness of my translation of the passage concerning Esau. The hypothetical character of the remainder of the passage in question is in perfect accord with the rules of Hebrew syntax and with Hebrew idiom.¹

Thus do the laboured confusions created by the Compilation Theory pass away, and the subtle symmetries and unities of the Pentateuch reveal themselves more and more to the patient and reverent investigator.

¹ The retirement of Esau, the elder son, from the family homestead, in favour of the younger son, Jacob, is intelligible only in the light of the JE narrative of Esau's forfeiture of his birthright and blessing. Yet the account of this retirement belongs to the so-called P section. As always, JE and P are organically one.

X

UNITY OF IDEAS

My demonstration of the untenability of the Compilation Theory is now practically complete, and my argument for the organic unity of the Pentateuch is nearly so. Little remains to be done beyond summing up the results into an ordered conclusion. I have proved in various ways the discriminative employment of Jahveh and Elohim in Genesis, and will now crown that proof with a brief analysis of the signification of their distribution. Gen. i.-ii. 3 is one of the *formal* sections, and in these sections, as I have shown, Elohim is appropriately employed throughout Genesis and in the first chapters of Exodus. In chapter ii. 4-iii. 24, the narrative belongs to the informal or idealistic section, but, as it gives prominence to God as Creator and as Guardian of moral law, the general name Elohim is added to the ideal name Jahveh, forming the combination, Jahveh Elohim. This general aspect recedes after the general vindication of moral law accomplished by the expulsion of man from Paradise, and then the name Jahveh appears alone. These distinc-

tions are transparently intelligible and irresistibly natural; but the Compilation Theory is involved in a hopeless puzzle in attempting to explain why Jahveh Elohim is used just to the end of the third chapter and no further, or, indeed, why it is used at all. The operation of the principle of discrimination is plainly present when, in the conversation between the serpent and the woman, Elohim is substituted for Jahveh Elohim, a delicate and suggestive touch. Eve yearns for the heart's ideal, and apparently believes that Cain will find it for his fallen parents. So she says: "I have gotten a man in relation to Jahveh." But her hopes were dashed to the ground, and at the birth of Seth she strikes a humbler note: "Elohim hath appointed me another seed instead of Abel; for Cain slew him." But the ideal was not dead, although men had to start at a lower stage; and the renewed search for Jahveh in Genesis commences at the words: "Then began men to call upon the name of Jahveh." Of these suggestive variations in Gen. iv. the Compilation Theory can offer no explanation at all. It collapses before them.

In chapter v. Elohim is employed, because this chapter belongs to the formal section. Some have maintained that, if there were consistent discrimination, Jahveh would have been more appropriate than Elohim in the words: "And Enoch walked with Elohim." But this suggestion betrays deficient acquaintance with the plan of Genesis and

with the ideal character of the name Jahveh. The complete *formal* relation involved in the phrase, "walking with," could not yet be used in relation to Jahveh. The phrase is used again in chapter vi. 9, and this time also with reference to Elohim. Such a formal and complete relation to Jahveh was not yet possible. Men "walked before Jahveh" or "called upon the name of Jahveh," but they did not yet "walk with" Jahveh.

In the informal portion at the commencement of Gen. vi., the discriminative use of Elohim is evident in the general phrase "sons of Elohim" in the midst of Jahveh verses. In Gen. vii. 16, there is a striking use of the name Jahveh in narrating a particular and intensely personal act of Divine interposition: "And Jahveh shut him in." With these exceptions, the names Jahveh and Elohim occur in a regular way, according as the passages are informal or formal, to the end of the sixteenth chapter. In chapter xvii. 1, by a natural sequence from chapter xvi., the name Jahveh is employed in marking the transition from the informal narrative to a formal covenant. In the covenant itself the name Elohim is appropriately used, but together with a more special covenant name, El Shaddai. From this point to the end of chapter xix. the appropriate names for the formal and idealistic portions respectively are regularly employed. In chapter xx. the name of God obtains a more general reference, because of Abimelech,

king of Gerar, and consequently Elohim prevails. But the chapter closes with another striking reference to the specially interposing Jahveh: "For Jahveh had fast closed up all the wombs of the house of Abimelech, because of Sarah, Abraham's wife." In Gen. xxi. 8 ff., Elohim is used in the former portion, because Ishmael separates himself from Abraham's house, and goes forth into the desert under the protection of the all-ruling God. In the remainder of the chapter, the general reference is maintained by the inclusion of Abimelech and Phicol. The effect of their inclusion is plainly shown in ver. 33. As soon as Abraham is left by himself, the record discriminatively says: "And Abraham . . . called there on the name of Jahveh." In Gen. xxii. it is Elohim, the sovereign Deity who has power over life and death, that asks for the life of Isaac. It was Jahveh who interposed to save the lad, and to bless the father, having seen that Abraham "feared Elohim" (ver. 12). The names now follow the general usage of the formal and informal parts as far as Gen. xxviii. 9. In xxviii. 10-22, the more general references to the universal God employ Elohim; in His special manifestation and interposition, He is Jahveh. The general messengers of heaven are "angels of Elohim," and the place of their presence is "the house of Elohim." But the God who *stood above him* was Jahveh. And just as, in the vision, the *general* consciousness of Elohim was succeeded

by the *particular* perception of Jahveh, so Jacob's vow (vv. 20-22) deepens from the name of Elohim to that of Jahveh.

In Gen. xxix. 31 *ff.*, the name Jahveh is appropriately used in God's special interposition on behalf of despised Leah. In chapter xxx. 1-24 the births are regarded as normal, and determined by the general providence of God (Elohim). But at the birth of Joseph, Rachel's anxiety for another son leads her to appeal for the interposition of Jahveh for that end. In chapter xxx. 27, Laban ascribes the blessing of his house to the special graciousness of the God of Jacob, whom he in this connection calls Jahveh. But in chapter xxxi. Jacob vindicates his claim to his acquisitions, not on the ground of the partial gifts of Divine favour, but on that of the righteousness of God's over-ruling providence, and consequently speaks of God as Elohim. In the record of Jacob's wrestling (chapter xxxii. 22-32), the proper might of man is pitted against the proper might of omnipotent God, who is, of course, Elohim.

It is quite unnecessary to carry the analysis through all the remaining steps, for the same key unlocks every door as we advance. It is remarkable how clear the distinctions are, when we consider that we are dealing with such an old document from the remote East. The Higher Critics have triumphantly affirmed that all attempts to demonstrate this psychological distinc-

tion between the Divine names "have simply failed, and need not be dealt with any more." This is Kuenen's phrase, and probably expresses his sincere wish and hope. When one considers how complete a failure the "single name" hypothesis has proved under our scrutiny, one might expect its advocates to speak with moderation of an attempt which, at least, aims at intelligibility. But, in the face of the demonstration which I have now given, Kuenen's assertion must withdraw itself. It might well have been that many delicate discriminations of the writer of the Pentateuch would baffle all our attempts to analyse them; and I hold that even a general proof of the operations of such discrimination (though the analysis of details might fail) would be quite sufficient to justify the rejection of the "single name" theory. But, as it happens, we can, as I have shown, distinctly and naturally—without any laborious ingenuities—trace the discriminated meanings line by line throughout the book of Genesis. If such nice and significant discriminations, so accurately and skilfully associated, are to be held as the result of a haphazard patchwork of discrepant "single name" documents, then of a certainty the Higher Critics must believe a greater miracle than any of the miracles which they have rejected.

As the whole of the book is united by the scheme of the significantly discriminated Divine names, so is it also welded in the unity of common

ideas. The religious and other conceptions of all sections of the work have a common likeness which evinces their common origin. The expression of these ideas is, of course, determined and limited by the different moulds into which the narrative is cast. In the formal sections, all ideas will be expressed with formal limitations, and expression will also be influenced according as God is thought of generally as Elohim, or particularly as Jahveh. But in all different forms the essential ideas are the same; and the assertion frequently made to the contrary by Higher Critics is void of foundation. A few examples will suffice.

Concerning man, the common conception prevails that he was created after the likeness of God (Gen. i. 26 and iii. 5; for it is plain that only creatures after the likeness of God could hope to attain such knowledge as was God's prerogative); that dominion over the lower animals was expressively given him by God (Gen. i. 26 and ii. 19, 20); that all the earth became corrupted by sin (Gen. vi. 1-6 and 11, 12); that the world was destroyed by a deluge for its sin; and that after the flood there was a wide distribution of the population of the earth (Gen. x. 32 and xi. 9).

Concerning Israel, all sections of the book hold the common ideas that the progeny of Jacob was chosen by God for a special and glorious destiny in the midst of the nations; that the promises to this end were first vested in Abraham; that the

link in Isaac was almost miraculously dependent upon God's favour; and that the final selection of the source of this favoured people was made in Jacob and his children, all the collateral branches having been excluded.

The representation of God is fundamentally consistent through all the sections. He is a God of righteousness, demanding righteousness in men (Gen. vi. 9 and vii. 1); He closely watches the affairs of the earth, and makes a note of its condition (Gen. vi. 5 and 12); He makes personal covenants with men, giving them special promises and blessings; He appears personally to men, in order to make a communication (Gen. xvii. 1 and xviii. 1); He is represented in an anthropomorphic way as "coming down" to men and "going up" from them (Gen. xi. 5 and xvii. 22); and generally as a God engaged in revealing Himself from more to more.

Such characteristic conceptions as the naming of places owing to some signal circumstance or occurrence, the bestowment of a new name upon persons in token of a new phase of destiny, and the rule of the Abrahamic family to marry among their Mesopotamian kindred, are unrestrictedly distributed in the general weft of the writing (Gen. xxviii. 19 and xxxv. 15; Gen. xvii. 5, 15 and xxxii. 28; Gen. xxiv. 3, 4 and xxvii. 46-xxviii. 2). In Genesis, sacrifices are treated as belonging to the Jahvistic or idealistic side of religion, but

in the later books the sacrificial idea is fully accepted and developed in the other section. It is not unimportant to add that all the sections are deeply imbued with the psychological treatment of names, both human and Divine.¹

It may be fairly said that the foregoing list exhausts the fundamental ideas of the Pentateuch, and that our demonstration of this unity completes the proof of the organic unity of the book. I have already shown that, if the Compilation Theory be broken down in Genesis, it is broken down for the whole of the Pentateuch. But, in order to give formal completeness to my task, I will devote a chapter to an examination of some salient points in the portions that remain.

¹ Dr. Driver has laboured hard to show that the ideas of JE and P are discrepant, a task in which he is not to be envied when he has the above striking agreements to encounter. He is compelled to admit that P, as well as JE, is anthropomorphic in his conception of God, but he snatches at the quibble that he does not use *anthropopathic* expressions. 'Tis a fine distinction, and has but this defect, that anthropomorphism most assuredly includes anthropopathism. The real difference is simply this, that the conditions of the *formal* section do not admit of the same variety and vividness of expression as the idealistic section; but the essence is identical. The same principle accounts for the fact that the formal section deals with the Abrahamic blessing as *formally* sealed in Abraham for his descendants; while the idealistic section gives hints of its world-wide scope. The interesting distribution of the contents of the book into formal and informal elements necessarily gives rise to variations of detail and standpoint; but these do not impair the fundamental unity of conception in which all the parts are combined. When Dr. Driver begins to search for unity, instead of discrepancy, he will have an easier task.

Before doing this, I turn to a question which may possibly be raised concerning the results of our investigations in Genesis. When one has conceded to these accumulated proofs the genuine organic unity of the Pentateuch, may it not be possible to hold that the writer found in the formal part a ready-made framework into which he wove the freer narrative known as JE, weaving it, of course, consistently with his framework, and creating by this means a homogeneous whole? I admit that such a method of composition might be quite consistent with organic unity; but the facts do not allow the hypothesis. In the earlier, and somewhat saner, days of Biblical criticism, hypothesis ran along the lines of assuming an original framework filled in by a supplementary writer. But this was found untenable, and then criticism, instead of becoming more cautious, ran wild. Our demonstrations have shown that the sections are mutually dependent, and must have been composed, as they now appear, in organic unity.¹

¹ Wellhausen, in his Pentateuch article in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," makes a remarkable admission which completely stultifies the Compilation Theory, though he seems singularly unconscious of a logical effect which is perfectly simple and plain. He writes: "The several threads of narrative which run side by side in the Pentateuch are so distinct in point of form that critics were long disposed to assume that in point of substance also they are independent narratives, without mutual relation. This, however, is highly improbable on general considerations, and is seen to be quite impossible when regard is paid to the close correspondence of the several sources in regard to the *arrangement* of the

They are the product of one informing principle and of profoundly related processes of thought. Whence the writer drew his materials is a question which does not come within the scope of the present investigation. Whencesoever he obtained them, he wove them into a true organic unity.

historical matter they contain. It is because the arrangement is so similar in *all the narratives* that it was possible to weave them together into one book. And besides this, we find a close agreement in many notable points of detail."

The confession of an indisputable fact! But how does Wellhausen account for this "mutual relation" and this complete "similarity of arrangement"? His answer is most astonishing. The documents are precisely similar in arrangement, because they were written in successive stages of the nation's history, and are thus "phases in a living process." Could any one dream of anything more inconsequent? Parallel histories, when written in successive periods of a nation's history, are naturally written with such similar arrangement that they can be easily "woven together into one book." Wellhausen had no sense of humour, else I should think that he laughed in his sleeve when he wrote that nullity. Such similarity of arrangement as he admits to exist between the different sections of the Pentateuch can be reasonably explained only as the product of a co-ordinating mind, so that his admission is really an admission of the organic unity of the complex Pentateuchal document. The modern Compilation Theory ignores this significant similarity of arrangement, and denies mutual relation and agreement, and thus maintains the very position which Wellhausen, the high priest of the Higher Critics, declares to be quite impossible.

XI

A GENERAL SURVEY

THE demonstration we have given of the organic unity of J, E, and P is so complete, that a detailed examination of the remainder of the Pentateuch is unnecessary. I will, however, scrutinise one or two crucial points which may add to the formal completeness of the evidence. The Decalogue is so important in this connection that we will subject it to a brief but conclusive examination. To those who are able to appreciate the bearing and significance of circuitous and improbable ingenuities in criticism, we would recommend the reading of Dr. Driver's discussion of the question of the Decalogue.

He ascribes the Decalogue in Exodus xx. to the supposed author E, because it is prefaced by a sentence in which Elohim is used to designate God. I have already pointed out that the continued employment of the name Elohim by this writer is utterly inexplicable after the revelation given by him of the name Jahveh in Exodus iii. The reason given for identifying his hand in Exodus xx. 1 is, therefore, not critically valid. Besides,

Dr. Driver is obliged to confess that the literary style of the Decalogue does not correspond with the limited style which the Higher Critic assigns to E. It is equally clear that it is not in the circumscribed style which is critically permitted to J. The confusion of the Higher Critic is completed by the fact that verse 11 contains a distinct and accurate reference to the account given by P in Gen. ii. 2, 3.

The natural and reasonable inference is, that the Decalogue was certainly written by the author who wrote the Genesis sections which have been labelled P, and that in the vital movement of this moral code we obtain a succinct view of the varied and comprehensive scope of his literary style. That conclusion is consistent with the unity which we have already established, explains the contents of the Decalogue without the employment of wild and baseless conjectures, and naturally relates the Decalogue to the rest of the Pentateuchal contents.

In any case, since the presence of P is so prominent in the Decalogue, why not assign at least the substance of it to that writer? Let my reader mark the reason well. Whatever marks of P it may contain, the Higher Critic cannot accept the simple and natural conclusions of those marks, because he is committed to the hypothesis that P did not write his document until after the exile, while he is compelled to admit that the Decalogue was known and written long before that time.

Therefore he fixes upon the supposed earlier writer E, and assigns the Decalogue to his "document," although bound to admit that it bears few marks of the style of that writer. I must say that to my mind this is nothing short of critical acrobaticism, which would on "neutral" ground be treated as ludicrous. Dr. Driver's statement of the critical position gives an interesting view of the twistings, turnings, and wriggings of the Higher Criticism in reference to the Decalogue. My readers will now be able to appreciate these fully. He writes—

"The Decalogue was, of course, derived by E from a pre-existing source, at least the substance of it being engraven on the tables in the Ark, and incorporated by him in his narrative."

For this conjecture Dr. Driver utters no iota of proof. His "of course" is merely pontifical in so far as it implies that the original style of the Decalogue was not the style of the author of the Pentateuch. As to the tables of stone, Wellhausen, the chief of the Higher Critics, makes a blind guess in an entirely opposite direction. For he says: "If there were such stones in the ark—and probably there were—there was nothing written on them." One wild guess is as good as another, and both are quite worthless for critical purposes. As a matter of fact, the Sabbath commandment strongly indicates that the Decalogue is by the author of P. But this simple conclusion is in itself sufficient to overturn all the laboriously erected structure of the

Higher Criticism, and to strew the Compilation Theory to the winds. For it pushes back the P section to an earlier date than can be admitted by that theory without total dissolution. The difficulty is, of course, surmounted by the usual arbitrary expedients, namely, by the introduction of conjectural recensions, interpolations, etc. How far these are admissible, even as conjectures, it will be for each reader to judge for himself; but concerning the attempt to claim finality for conclusions so entirely speculative there can scarcely be two serious opinions.

Dr. Driver rightly asserts that "some interesting critical questions arise from a comparison of the Decalogue as here given (Exodus xx.) with the form in which it is repeated in Deut. v." But the deductions which the critics make are chiefly noticeable for being unnatural and strained, and for overlooking the simple and obvious relation in which the two passages stand to one another. It seems a fixed custom with the Higher Critic never to recognise conditions which evidence organic unity, even when they are of the most obvious kind. Let my readers, therefore, note this well. The utterance of the Decalogue in Deut. v. expressly assumes and refers to the *previous* proclamation of the Decalogue in Exodus xx., and the whole form, manner, and diction of the announcement in the former passage are precisely those which were natural to a speaker calling to mind and freely enforcing a previously delivered

commandment. The psychological indications are as clear as they are delicately natural.

In the original proclamation (Exodus xx.) the formal covenantal term "Remember" (which we have noticed in Genesis in the P section) is employed in the Sabbath commandment: "*Remember* the Sabbath day to keep it holy." This, therefore, marks the basal or original form of the commandment. In Deuteronomy, where the reference is to a commandment already formulated, the writer uses the freer hortatory word, "Observe."

In the beginning of the Decalogue in Exodus, the words occur, "I am Jahveh thy Elohim." To this preface the section in Deuteronomy makes repeated informal allusion in the phrase, "As Jahveh thy Elohim commanded thee."

In the Sabbath commandment in Exodus the reason assigned for the observance of the Sabbath is fundamentally related to the Sabbath law as a whole: which is precisely what would be required in the original commandment. But in the reproduction of that commandment in Deuteronomy, a single clause of the injunction is informally singled out for comment, and is enforced by a special motive. This is exactly what would be likely to happen in the recapitulation and enforcement of a known commandment by way of exhortation, when the emphasis of the speaker would be determined by the circumstances of the hour. The previous acquaintance of the people with the commandment would

enable the speaker to omit any portion at his pleasure, and to amplify and enforce to any extent which sorted with his feeling and judgment. These are the very phenomena which are found in the Deuteronomic Decalogue.

The same free characteristic of the exhortation, as distinguished from the original commandment, appears in explanatory amplifications in certain of the other laws of the Decalogue. Nothing can be simpler or plainer than the relation thus demonstrated between these two sections. The one in Exodus has all the marks of the more formal and original proclamation; the one in Deuteronomy shows all the features of free reproduction, amplification, and enforcement.

Yet out of this simple relation the Higher Criticism has elaborated a perfect labyrinth of perplexity and conjecture. Let Dr. Driver himself describe the tortuous process:—

“It has been conjectured that, as the comments in Exod. xx. 9, 10, 12 bear a singular resemblance to the style of Deuteronomy, they were in the first instance added in that book, and thence transferred subsequently to Exodus.” This characteristic conjecture merits attention. The Higher Critic has decreed by his Compilation Theory that the generally correspondent passages in Exod. xx. and Deut. v. are *not* by the same author. But, when he examines facts, he finds that certain parts of the one “bear a singular resemblance to the style” of

the other. Without the slightest reason, except the necessity of saving his theory, he straightway conjectures that the document of the one must at some unknown time have been manipulated by the other! Dr. Driver, to his credit, refuses to accept this particular evasion, yet he turns away from it with evident reluctance, affirming that "it is no doubt attractive and plausible." As far as I can perceive, its attractiveness consists only in the support which it offers to the precarious Compilation Theory. In itself it is sheer conjecture and bald improbability. Although Dr. Driver has not accepted it, I must warn my readers against this slippery device, because it has been adopted by other Higher Critics, and it will be difficult in the long run for any one to set aside this hypothesis of the Deuteronomic recension of the Decalogue without recanting the Compilation Theory.

Yet, while Dr. Driver feels compelled to concede the priority of Exodus xx., and admits that the Decalogue and some other [portions of Exodus "exhibit an approximation to the style of Deuteronomy," he attempts a similar feat of legerdemain to get rid of verse 11 in Exod. xx. The reason he offers for seeking to banish this verse is that "not only does it supply no elements for the style of Deuteronomy, but it is dissimilar in style to JE: in its first clause it resembles closely . . . passages belonging to P."

Putting it simply, the Decalogue in Exod. xx.

exhibits such comprehensiveness of style that, while Dr. Driver assigns it to the E document, he is forced to admit that it also distinctly employs the style of Deuteronomy. Not being able to follow Kuenen and others in juggling away the Deuteronomic element, he concedes that style to portions of Exodus, apparently not realising how fatal that concession is to his theory. But, when he also finds a passage in the Decalogue bearing the unmistakable marks of P, he cannot fail to see the imminence of the peril, and decides that verse 11 must be removed by one of the several expedients known to the Higher Criticism. The method of procedure is as follows:—

“As there is force in the remark that the author of Deuteronomy is not likely to have omitted the verse had it formed part of the Decalogue at the time when he wrote, it is not improbable that it was introduced into the text of Exodus subsequently, upon the basis of the two verses of P just cited.”

The reply to that is, that there is not the slightest critical force in the suggestion that every paragraph of the Exodus Decalogue would be likely to be repeated in the Deuteronomic address. In recalling to the minds of the people, for enforcement and admonition, the substantial provisions of a law with which they were already acquainted, omission was as likely an element as amplification. Besides, the Sabbath commandment in Exodus is thoroughly

homogeneous. In the 9th verse the detailed division of the week into six days for work and the seventh for rest is unmistakably related to the account of God's six days' work and seventh day rest in the P section in the beginning of Genesis, and therefore belongs as much to the P section as verse 11. And even Dr. Driver does not suggest the removal of the 9th verse. The 11th verse is the natural completion of the 9th and 10th verses, and cannot be removed on the lines of sound criticism.

Our examination of the general features of the Decalogue has yielded results in striking harmony with the conclusions forced upon us in the book of Genesis. I have shown that there are no critical grounds for treating the Decalogue in Exodus as other than a homogeneous whole; and it is admitted that it contains a breadth and variation of style which constitute it a sort of miniature representation of the manifold style of the Pentateuch. The author of it combines the style of P with that of Deuteronomy, and evinces affinities likewise with other sections of the Pentateuch. The ghostly array of imaginary documents and redactors fades away, and in their stead appears one great thinking mind, a writer of comprehensive thought and literary breadth, moulding his literary style in subtle and exquisitely sensitive responsiveness to varying theme, idea, standpoint, and aim. This is the key to all the variations of the Pentateuch, to the formal

sections, to the picturesque narration of events, to the admonitory periods of Deuteronomy, and to the characteristic phraseology of the laws of holiness. The theories which deny the organic unity of the Pentateuch are overthrown by the phenomena of the Pentateuch *as it now stands*; and we cannot allow the Higher Critics to fabricate another.

It may be necessary to allude in conclusion to the assertion made by the Higher Criticism that the Pentateuch betrays, in reference to altars, discrepancies which reveal a changing relation to successive epochs of time. The Critics affirm that JE teaches the right of erecting altars for worship anywhere; that Deuteronomy clearly belongs to a later period, because it expresses a desire for a central sanctuary; and that P must belong to a later era still, because the centralisation of worship is treated by it as fully realised.

If this were really so, the Higher Critic might still have a last line of defence for his theory; but the statement is an entire misrepresentation of the facts. It seems to have originated with Wellhausen, and was based upon his reckless assumption that the tabernacle is unhistorical. The true order of succession in the Pentateuch ends, not with the P section, but with Deuteronomy, and is contained, not by epochs, but only by years. The various references to altars in the Pentateuch are perfectly consistent with all that we have deduced

in the present investigation. The informal portions deal with the freer side of worship and those informal relations with God to which man instinctively returns in unsettled times. The narrative of P describes and enjoins the settled and centralised worship which gathered around the tabernacle in the wilderness. In Deuteronomy Moses is represented as looking forward to the settlement of the tribes in Canaan. He foresees an inevitable period of unsettlement, but looks beyond it to the days when the religion of Israel should be unified by a central sanctuary, as it *had been* during their desert march. The sequence from Genesis to Deuteronomy is in perfect historical order. The whole is in true organic unity.

XII

CONCLUSION

THE question may be asked: What is the gain of the foregoing demonstration, and the conclusions arrived at? The gain is manifold. Truth is always profitable, and the refutation of false opinions is a public service. I am no stickler for the maintenance of traditionary notions or ancient beliefs. I have had no interest in writing this book save that of ascertaining and defending the truth. I have written because I firmly hold that the minds of men have been injured in recent times by the dissemination of false notions respecting the composition of the Pentateuch, notions which have obtained an inflated credit through being represented as certain conclusions of scientific criticism.

I claim that my demonstrations will be a distinct gain for the cause of genuine criticism. The right of free criticism is valuable and important; but if its representatives discredit its operations by violent conjecture and biassed speculativeness, criticism itself will fall into contempt, and its legitimate utterances will be ignored. It has been my aim to restore sanity to the criticism

of the Pentateuch, and to compel rigid adherence to critical law in every detail of the investigation. If I have succeeded, criticism will receive substantial benefit.

The conclusions of this book are an immense gain for the intellectual interest of the Pentateuch. Recognition has frequently been made of the analytical service rendered in certain directions by the operations of the Higher Criticism, but the net result of its treatment of the Pentateuch is nothing less than intellectual demoralisation. There can be no intellectual interest, except of the lowest kind, in a compilation which is affirmed to be a conglomerated chaos of discrepant legends. The inspiration of intellectual synthesis has been banished. The mind is doomed to wander in a wilderness of barren contradictions and confusions.

My demonstrations have restored the fulness of intellectual interest to the study of the Pentateuch. The composition appears once more as an intelligible unity, and even as a subtle and beautiful harmony. Once more the intellect may experience the delight of unifying the apparently discrepant, and of harmonising the manifold in the deeper synthesis of the author's organising mind. In this vital unity the Pentateuch is as a tree of life for the thinker; in the theory of compiled discrepancies it is but as a valley of dry bones.

This demonstration will also maintain and induce due reverence for the authority of the sacred

Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. It is difficult to conceive that any one of impartial judgment can deny that the Compilation Theory of the Pentateuch has discredited its authority, and banished every notion of inspiration which could inspire reverence for it as the Word of God. No evasive ingenuities can ever give Divine authority over the spirits of men to an incoherent tangle of mutually conflicting legends and a false history fabricated by a designing priesthood. Common-sense will prevail over all sophistries, and reverence will withdraw itself from the oracle of confusion. Nor can the effect tarry with the Pentateuch. The sacred Scriptures as a whole will lose credit. If any idea of inspiration be retained, it will be but a barren term from which all Divine glory has departed.

But, when the Pentateuch is seen to be the unified product of a sublime central idea, working out a consistent purpose by which all its wonderfully varied parts are combined in organic harmony, a masterpiece of subtle unities and not a chaos of stark discrepancies, the veritable movement of a Divine ideal forbidding confusion and creating delicate symmetries; then it is perceived to be the appropriate beginning of that sacred revelation of God which is above every other. It is thus a part of that sacred Word of God which is not on a level with ethnic religious literatures, but belongs to a unique channel of special inspira-

tion, that transcendent communication of the thought of God in the direct line of which came the Son of God, the effulgence of the Father's glory, and the very impress of His person. The faith in this supernatural revelation, and the lowly reverence for God's Word by which it is attended, are encouraged and stimulated by these conclusions, even as they are discouraged by the naturalistic hypotheses of the Higher Criticism.

My demonstrations produce this further gain, that they vindicate the assertion of intellectual liberty and independence against the tyrannous decrees of the Higher Criticism. While acting in the name of freedom, it has attempted to hamper freedom. The *fiat* has gone forth that its conclusions cannot be rejected except on pain of losing intellectual caste. As a result, a large company have entered into the select fellowship like sheep into a sheepfold. Critical independence has all but disappeared, and intellectual superiority is supposed to consist in a slavish repetition of the opinions of Wellhausen, Kuenen, and others of the same species.

I venture to affirm with all confidence that the demonstrations in this volume afford intellectual justification for fundamentally dissenting from the opinions of these naturalistic critics, and for repudiating their pontifical claim to coerce the judgment of others with a kind of intellectual ultimatum. Any man who reads the arguments in

this book can maintain his intellectual self-respect while he rejects the critical theories which have been built up by the questionable methods which I have, I trust, sufficiently exposed.

The demonstration of the organic unity of the Pentateuch overthrows also the dates assigned by the Higher Critics to the various "documents" which they have invented. The supposed latest portions cannot be later than the earliest, for they are organically one. How far the whole must be carried back can, however, only be determined by a further examination of the evidence supplied on this point by this remarkable document. Our present task is done.

FINIS

By SIR ROBERT ANDERSON, K.C.B.

Pseudo-Criticism

The Higher Criticism and Its Counterfeit

Large crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.

"This is not an ordinary book. . . . It is the personal witness of one who has a thorough acquaintance with the nature of the system which he attacks, written from the heart and with something like prophetic fervour."—*The Church Family Newspaper*.

The Gospel and Its Ministry

A Handbook of Evangelical Truth

Eleventh Edition, Revised and Enlarged

Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

"These essays contemplate the most stupendous subjects which can occupy human thought. . . . The chapters on 'Grace' and 'The Cross' are well worth their weight in gold."—*The Christian*.

Daniel in the Critics' Den

A Reply to Professor Driver and the
late Dean of Canterbury

Second Edition. Large crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net

"Impossible not to enjoy the exposition."—*Saturday Review*.

"His very ingenious and apparently cogent elucidation of the seventy weeks."—*The Times*.

JAMES NISBET & CO., LIMITED

21 BERNERS STREET, LONDON, W.

Bishop Ryle and Genesis

An Examination of his

“Early Narratives of Genesis”

By the REV. GEO. ENSOR, M.A.

Vicar of Heywood, Wiltshire

Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net

“This is a most earnest and able treatise upon Bishop Ryle’s work on ‘Genesis and the Higher Criticism.’ . . .”—*Church Bells*.

“Mr. Ensor appears to us to place the Bishop in a very difficult position by his treatment of such points as our Lord’s testimony to the historicity of the Old Testament, and the theories as to documents underlying Genesis. The book will be found useful among young people whose minds have been more or less unsettled by attacks on Scripture.”—*The Christian*.

“Mr. Ensor patiently analyses many of Dr. Ryle’s objections to the authenticity of certain portions of the narrative of Genesis, with a view of showing how great is the confusion in the Bishop’s views.”—*The Christian Commonwealth*.

JAMES NISBET & CO., LIMITED

21 BERNERS STREET, LONDON, W.

A SELECT LIST FROM
JAMES NISBET & CO.'S
RELIGIOUS PUBLICATIONS

*A complete list will be forwarded, post free, on application,
to the Publishers.*

FRANCES RIDLEY HAVERGAL.

32mo, 1s. 6d.

UNDER THE SURFACE.

UNDER THE SHADOW.

THE MINISTRY OF SONG.

16mo, 1s.

MY KING.

ROYAL COMMANDMENTS.

ROYAL BOUNTY.

THE ROYAL INVITATION.

LOYAL RESPONSES.

KEPT FOR THE MASTER'S USE.

STARLIGHT THROUGH THE SHADOWS.

32mo, 9d.

MORNING BELLS; or, Waking Thoughts for the Little
Ones. Paper cover, 6d.

LITTLE PILLOWS. Being Good Night Thoughts for the
Little Ones. Paper cover, 6d.

MORNING STARS; or, Names of Christ for His Little
Ones.

MEMORIALS OF FRANCES RIDLEY HAVERGAL. By
her SISTER. Best Edition, 6s. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. Cheap
Edition, cloth, 1s. 6d.; paper covers, 6d.

Works Devotional and Practical

By R. A. TORREY.

REAL SALVATION, AND WHOLE-HEARTED SERVICE. A Series of Addresses. Large crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

TALKS TO MEN ABOUT THE BIBLE AND THE CHRIST OF THE BIBLE. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. ; in paper covers, 6d. *net*.

REVIVAL ADDRESSES. Large crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

HOW TO WORK. Demy 8vo, 7s. 6d.

"A timely production—just the volume for these days of 'united missions,' 'great campaigns,' and 'national crusades.' . . . We should like to see it in the hands of every Church member, as well as minister."—CHRISTIAN COMMONWEALTH.

THE GIST OF THE LESSONS FOR 1905. Long pott 8vo, Leather, 1s. *net* ; in Cloth Limp, 9d. *net*.

"For the busy teacher . . . the book is most valuable."—THE FRIEND.

HOW TO PRAY. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. ; paper covers, 6d. *net*.

THE DIVINE ORIGIN OF THE BIBLE. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

"The pages are impressive in fact and strong in argument—such a book was wanted."—THE CHRISTIAN.

WHAT THE BIBLE TEACHES. Demy 8vo, 7s. 6d.

"A really remarkable book. The very simplicity of the method helping to a clear understanding of the doctrine treated."—THE RECORD.

HOW TO OBTAIN FULNESS OF POWER. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

"The volume should prove invaluable to seekers after fruitfulness."—THE CHRISTIAN.

HOW TO BRING MEN TO CHRIST. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. ; paper covers, 6d. *net*.

HOW TO STUDY THE BIBLE FOR GREATEST PROFIT. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

"Every word tells and conveys precious facts of persistent Bible research . . . we warmly commend this admirable little compendium."—SWORD AND TROWEL.

THE BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT. Crown 8vo, 1s.

"Helpful to all who desire to make their Christian discipleship a reality."—THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

THE VEST POCKET COMPANION FOR CHRISTIAN WORKERS. In Leather, 1s. *net*.

"A capital little book for workers."—THE ROCK.

By FRANCES A. BEVAN.

COME! Gospel Hymns. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

HYMNS OF TER STEEGEN, SUSO, AND OTHERS.
FIRST SERIES. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

"The literary quality of many of the hymns will be welcome to many lovers of sacred poetry."—*Manchester Guardian*.

"The versification is good, and many of the hymns are worthy of a recognised place in English Hymnology."—*Aberdeen Free Press*.

HYMNS OF TER STEEGEN AND OTHERS. SECOND
SERIES. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

"A volume of very choice pieces."—*The Christian*.

"Choicely printed volume, sure to be prized highly as a gift book . . . remarkable for sweetness and the strength of its sober exaltation."—*Yorkshire Post*.

MATELDA AND THE CLOISTER OF HELLFDE.
Translations from the Book of Matilda of Magdeburg (supposed to be Dante's Matilda). Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

TREES PLANTED BY THE RIVER. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d.

"This excellent book will commend itself to many a contemplative Christian during hours of quiet communion with his own soul and with God."—*Christian Commonwealth*.

"A deeply interesting book."—*Aberdeen Free Press*.

THREE FRIENDS OF GOD. Records from the Lives of
JOHN TAULER, NICHOLAS OF BASLE, HENRY SUSO. Crown
8vo, 2s. 6d.

"Fascinating glimpses of the strange religious life of mediæval Europe. No student of history and human nature can fail to be interested by this book, while to pious minds it will bring stimulus and edification."—*Scotsman*.

"The simplicity and austerity of life of these great men are depicted with graphic and sympathetic touch."—*Court Journal*.

By the Rev. J. REID HOWATT.

THE CHILDREN'S PREACHER. A Year's Addresses
and Parables for the Young. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

THE CHILDREN'S PEW. Sermons to Children. Crown
8vo, 2s. 6d.

THE CHILDREN'S PULPIT. A Year's Sermons and
Parables for the Young. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

THE CHILDREN'S ANGEL. Being a Volume of Sermons
to Children. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

YOUTH'S IDEALS. Small crown 8vo, 1s.

"So bright and cheerful, so clever and well written, yet so full of deep
Christian earnestness, that we would like to see it circulated by tens of
thousands."—*The New Age*.

AFTER HOURS ; or, The Religion of Our Leisure Time.
With Appendix on How to Form a Library for Twenty Shillings.
Small crown 8vo, 1s.

THE CHILDREN'S PRAYER BOOK : Devotions for the
Use of the Young for One Month. Cloth extra, pott 8vo, 1s.

LIFE WITH A PURPOSE. A Book for Girls and Young
Men. Crown 8vo, 1s.

THE BIBLICAL LIBRARY.

A Series of Volumes on Biblical Subjects written by able and well-known scholars, and designed so that, whilst helpful to the student, they will be of great interest to the general reader. Full crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. each.

VOL. I.

THE HERODS. By the Very Rev. F. W. FARRAR, D.D. F.R.S., Dean of Canterbury.

VOL. II.

WOMEN OF THE OLD TESTAMENT: STUDIES IN WOMANHOOD. By the Rev. R. F. HORTON, M.A., D.D.

VOL. III.

THE HISTORY OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY. By Rev. LEIGHTON PULLAN, of Oxford University.

VOL. IV.

WOMEN OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Rev. Professor W. F. ADENEX.

VOL. V.

THE FAITH OF CENTURIES. By the BISHOP OF ROCHESTER, the BISHOP OF CALCUTTA, Bishop BARRY, Canon SCOTT HOLLAND, Professor RYLE, and others.

By the Rev. GEORGE MATHESON, D.D.

TIMES OF RETIREMENT. A Volume of Devotional Readings. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

MOMENTS ON THE MOUNT. A Series of Devotional Meditations. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

VOICES OF THE SPIRIT. Small crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

By the Rev. JAMES WELLS, M.A.

BIBLE OBJECT LESSONS. Addresses to Children. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

BIBLE ECHOES. Addresses to the Young. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

THE PARABLES OF JESUS. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Works Devotional and Practical

By the Rev. A. T. PIERSON, D.D.

GOD'S LIVING ORACLES. Large crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. net.

THE MODERN MISSION CENTURY. A Review of the Missions of the Nineteenth Century with Reference to the Superintending Providence of God. Large crown 8vo, 6s.

GEORGE MÜLLER OF BRISTOL. With 13 full-page illustrations. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. net.

THE NEW ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. Being Lectures on Foreign Missions delivered under the Duff Endowment. With Coloured Chart, showing the Religions of the World and the Progress of Evangelisation. Extra crown 8vo, 6s.

"As a repertory of missionary facts and arguments, this work is as deeply interesting as the style is truly enthusiastic, and we bespeak for it a wide circle of readers, whom it will assuredly stimulate to increased zeal in sending the Gospel throughout the world."—*Christian*.

"Such a work as this ought greatly to help in the evangelisation of the whole world."—*Sword and Trowel*.

"Emphatically the handbook of Missions."—*Presbyterian*.

THE CRISIS OF MISSIONS; OR, THE VOICE OUT OF THE CLOUD. Small crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

"A book full of the right kind of inspiration. A book emphatically for the times."—*Christian Commonwealth*.

THE ONE GOSPEL; OR, THE COMBINATION OF THE NARRATIVES OF THE FOUR EVANGELISTS IN ONE COMPLETE RECORD. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

"It is a skilful mosaic of the four Gospels in one design."—*Rock*.

By **FREDERICK A. ATKINS,**

Editor of "The Young Man," and Hon. Sec. of the National Anti-Gambling League.

ASPIRATION AND ACHIEVEMENT. A Young Man's Message to Young Men. Small crown 8vo, 1s.

Dr. R. F. HORTON writes: "I have rarely read a more salutary book."

MORAL MUSCLE: AND HOW TO USE IT. A Brotherly Chat with Young Men. By F. A. ATKINS, Editor of "The Young Man." With an Introduction by Rev. THAIN DAVIDSON, D.D. Small crown 8vo, 1s.

Dr. CLIFFORD writes: "It is full of life, throbs with energy, is rich in stimulus, and bright with hope."

FIRST BATTLES, AND HOW TO FIGHT THEM. By F. A. ATKINS, Editor of "The Young Man." Small crown 8vo, 1s.

"Another of Mr. Atkins' capital little books for young men."—*British Weekly*.

Published by James Nisbet & Co., Limited.

NISBET'S CHURCH OF ENGLAND HANDBOOKS.

EDITED BY THE REV. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS,

And dealing briefly but effectively with the principal points of
Church doctrine and ritual now in dispute.

Small Crown 8vo. Each 1s.

THE CONFESSIONAL IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the Rev. A. R. BUCKLAND, M.A.

THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM. By the Rev. Canon HAY M. H. AITKEN, M.A.

HOW WE GOT OUR PRAYER-BOOK. By the Rev. T. W. DRURY, B.D.

THE CHURCHMAN'S A. B. C.

THE EVANGELICAL SCHOOL IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By the Rt. Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF DURHAM.

THE DEEPER LIFE SERIES.

EDITED BY REV. E. W. MOORE, M.A.

Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

THE CHRIST LIFE. By the Rev. J. B. FIGGIS, M.A.,
Author of "Christ and Full Salvation," "The Anointing," &c.

CONSECRATED WORK. By the Rev. J. ELDER CUMMING, D.D.

SET TO OBEY. By the Rev. F. S. WEBSTER, M.A.

SECRETS OF SANCTITY. By the Rev. A. E. BARNES-LAWRENCE, M.A.

PERSONAL CONSECRATION. By the Rev. HUBERT BROOKE, M.A.

THE SPIRIT'S SEAL. By the Rev. E. W. MOORE, M.A.

Works of the Rev. ANDREW MURRAY.

"All that this author writes is good."—*Christian Commonwealth.*

THE KEY TO THE MISSIONARY PROBLEM. Small crown 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d. ; paper covers, 1s. 6d.

WORKING FOR GOD. Pott 8vo, 1s.

THY WILL BE DONE. Small crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

DYING TO SELF. Extracts from the Writings of **WILLIAM LAW.** Crown 16mo, 1s. Gilt edges, 1s. 6d.

THE MYSTERY OF THE TRUE VINE. Meditations for a Month. Crown 16mo, 1s. Gilt edges, 1s. 6d.

"Earnest and pious in tone, simple in style and language, these meditations will be of help, comfort, and stimulus to many a devout reader."—*Dundee Advertiser.*

THE LORD'S TABLE. A Help to the Right Observance of the Holy Supper. Pott 8vo, 1s.

OUT OF HIS FULNESS. A Series of Addresses. Small Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

WAITING ON GOD. Extra pott 8vo, 1s. ; roan, gilt edges, 2s. Seventeenth thousand.

"Admirers of Mr. Murray's deeply religious and deeply thoughtful style should have this pocket volume of meditation."—*Literary World.*

THE POWER OF THE SPIRIT. With additional Extracts from the Writings of William Law. Selected, and with an Introduction. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

HAVE MERCY ON ME: The Prayer of the Penitent in the 51st Psalm Explained and Applied. Small crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. ; in superior binding, 2s. 6d.

"It is done so quietly, with such a mastery of all the motives which actuate men, and with such easy power, that it is only on reflection that we find out how rare is the gift of the author."—*Aberdeen Free Press.*

THE HOLIEST OF ALL: An Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Seventh Thousand, post 4to, 6s.

"A true exposition, not a piece of arbitrary moralising on a sacred text. But it is also a true book of devotion."—*British Weekly.*

HUMILITY: The Beauty of Holiness. Cloth extra, pott 8vo, 1s. ; roan, gilt edges, 2s. Fifteenth thousand.

LET US DRAW NIGH. Fifth Thousand. Cloth extra, pott 8vo, 1s. ; roan, gilt edges, 2s.

"A spiritually helpful little book."—*British Messenger.*

WHY DO YOU NOT BELIEVE? Cloth extra, pott 8vo, 1s. ; roan, gilt edges, 2s. Tenth thousand.

BE PERFECT: A Message from the Father in Heaven to His Children on Earth. Meditations for a Month. Cloth extra, pott 8vo, 1s. ; roan, gilt edges, 2s. Sixteenth thousand.

THE MINISTRY OF INTERCESSION. A Plea for more Prayer. Small crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. Cheap Edition, 1s. 6d.

ABIDE IN CHRIST: Thoughts on the Blessed Life of Fellowship with the Son of God. Eighty-eighth Thousand, small crown 8vo, new and cheaper edition, 1s. net; also in superior binding, 2s. 6d.

"The varied aspects of this practical truth are treated with much freshness, power and unction. It cannot fail to stimulate, to cheer, and to qualify for higher service."—*Mr. SPURGEON in the Sword and Trowel.*

LIKE CHRIST. Thoughts on the Blessed Life of Conformity to the Son of God. A Sequel to "Abide in Christ." Thirty-sixth Thousand, small crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

"The author has written with such loving unction and spiritual insight, that his pages may be read with comfort and edification by all."—*Literary Churchman.*

WITH CHRIST IN THE SCHOOL OF PRAYER. Thoughts on our Training for the Ministry of Intercession. Forty-second Thousand, small crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. Cheap Edition, 1s. net.

"A volume of rare excellence, and one which is much needed."—*Christian News.*

THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST. Thoughts on the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Believer and the Church. Nineteenth Thousand, small crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. Cheap Edition, 1s. net.

HOLY IN CHRIST. Thoughts on the Calling of God's Children to be Holy as He is Holy. Sixteenth Thousand, small crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

"This is one of the best books we have seen upon a subject which is happily attracting much attention nowadays."—*Methodist N. C. Magazine.*

THE CHILDREN FOR CHRIST. Thoughts for Christian Parents on the Consecration of the Home Life. Eleventh Thousand, small crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

"All Sunday-school teachers and parents would do well to lay its lessons to heart."—*Methodist Recorder.*

THE NEW LIFE. Words of God for Disciples of Christ. Sixteenth Thousand, small crown 8vo, 2s. 6d. Cheap Edition, small crown 8vo, 1s. net.

"This book stands out among many of its kind as distinguished by a new impulse and freshness of thought."—*Scotsman.*

WHOLLY FOR GOD: The True Christian Life. A series of Extracts from the Writings of William Law. Selected, and with an introduction by the Rev. ANDREW MURRAY. Crown 8vo, handsomely bound, gilt top, 5s.

"This volume of selections is admirable."—*Publishers' Circular.*

Series of Books for Young Men and Girls.

By DR. MILLER, F. A. ATKINS, REV. J. REID HOWATT,
AND OTHERS.

YOUNG MEN AND GIRLS: FAULTS AND IDEALS. By
Dr. J. R. MILLER, Author of "Making the Most of Life,"
"Glimpses through Life's Window," &c. &c. Small crown 8vo, 1s.
Also sold separately, charmingly bound in leatherette, 6d. each.

ASPIRATION AND ACHIEVEMENT. A Young Man's
Message to Young Men. By F. A. ATKINS, Editor of *The Young
Man*. Small crown 8vo, 1s.

Dr. R. F. HORTON writes: "I have rarely read a more salutary book."

LIFE WITH A PURPOSE. By Rev. J. REID HOWATT
Small crown 8vo, 1s.

MORAL MUSCLE: AND HOW TO USE IT. A Brotherly
Chat with Young Men. By F. A. ATKINS, Editor of *The Young
Man*. With an Introduction by Rev. THAIN DAVIDSON, D.D.
Small crown 8vo, 1s.

YOUTH'S IDEALS. By the Rev. J. REID HOWATT.
Small crown 8vo, 1s.

FIRST BATTLES, AND HOW TO FIGHT THEM. By
F. A. ATKINS, Editor of *The Young Man*. Small crown 8vo, 1s.

**AFTER HOURS; OR, THE RELIGION OF OUR LEISURE
TIME.** By the Rev. J. REID HOWATT. With Appendix on How
to Form a Library for Twenty Shillings. Small crown 8vo, 1s.

HOW TO STUDY THE BIBLE. By Dr. CLIFFORD, M.A.;
Professor ELMSLIE, D.D.; R. F. HORTON, M.A.; Rev. F. B.
MEYER, B.A.; Rev. C. H. WALLER, M.A.; Rev. H. C. G.
MOULE, M.A.; Rev. C. A. BERRY; Rev. J. W. DAWSON. Third
Edition. Small crown 8vo, 1s.

Published by James Nisbet & Co., Limited.

By Mrs. PEARSALL SMITH,

Author of "The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life."

THE UNSELFISHNESS OF GOD, AND HOW I DISCOVERED IT. Large crown 8vo, 6s.

OLD TESTAMENT TYPES AND TEACHINGS. Crown 8vo, 5s.

EDUCATE OUR MOTHERS; or, Wise Motherhood. Crown 8vo, 1s.

EVERY-DAY RELIGION. The Common-Sense Teaching of the Bible. Crown 8vo, 2s.; cloth limp, 1s. 6d.; paper cover, 1s.

"Passages of Scripture are brought together in a manner that marvellously illuminates the subjects discussed; and the expositions are most clear in thought and apt in illustration."—*Life of Faith*.

THE CHRISTIAN'S SECRET OF A HAPPY LIFE. By H. W. S. Revised Edition. Small crown 8vo, paper cover, 1s.; cloth limp, 1s. 6d.; cloth, 2s.; with gilt top, 2s. 6d.; cloth, gilt edges, 3s.

"Full of bright and cheering thoughts."—*Church Bells*.

"A book that is capable of doing untold good in the way of promoting a more entire surrender of the soul and consecration to the will of God."—*Rock*.

THE CHRISTIAN UNDER REVIEW.

A SERIES OF WORKS ON PRACTICAL CHRISTIAN LIFE.

Small crown 8vo.

THE CHRISTIAN'S INFLUENCE. By the Ven. WILLIAM MACDONALD SINCLAIR, D.D., Archdeacon of London. 2s.

THE CHRISTIAN'S START. By the Very Rev. the DEAN OF NORWICH. 1s.

THE MORAL CULTURE OF THE CHRISTIAN. By the Rev. JAMES McCANN, D.D. 1s.

THE PATHWAY OF VICTORY. By the Rev. ROBERT B. GIRDLESTONE, M.A., Hon. Canon of Christ Church, and late Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford. 1s.

THE CHRISTIAN'S DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES. By the Very Rev. the DEAN OF NORWICH. 1s.

THE CHRISTIAN'S AIMS. By the Rev. ALFRED PEARSON, M.A. 1s.

THE INTELLECTUAL CULTURE OF THE CHRISTIAN. By the Rev. JAMES McCANN, D.D. 1s.

THE CHRISTIAN'S PRIVILEGES. By the Rev. W. J. DEANE, M.A. 1s.

THE CHRISTIAN'S INHERITANCE. By the Rev. C. A. GOODHART, M.A. 1s.

"We dipped into these pages alike with pleasure and profit. The writers, each on his own theme, seem steadfastly to keep in view scriptural teaching, sound doctrine, and the trials and temptations which beset the daily life and walk of the believer."—*Word and Work*.

Works Devotional and Practical

By the Rev. GEORGE EVERARD, M.A.

- MERRY AND WISE. Talks with Schoolgirls. Pott 8vo, 1s.
- FIGHT AND WIN. Talks with Lads about the Battle of Life. Pott 8vo, 1s.
- LINED WITH LOVE. Friendly Talks with Young Girls about the Yoke of the Lord Jesus. Pott 8vo, 1s.
- IN SECRET. A Manual of Private Prayer. 16mo, 1s.
- "IN THE MORNING." A Scripture Prayer and a Meditation for each Morning in the Month. 16mo, 1s.
- "IN THE EVENING." Thirty-one Scripture Promises with a Meditation for Every Evening in the Month. 16mo, 1s.
- THE SHIELD, THE SWORD, AND THE BATTLE. Crown 16mo, 1s.
- YOUR SUNDAYS. Fifty-two short Readings, especially intended for Schoolboys. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.
- THE BELLS OF ST. PETER'S, and other Papers on Gospel Truth. 16mo, 1s.
- YOUR INNINGS. A Book for Schoolboys. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.
- HIS STEPS: Traced in the Great Biography. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.
- THE RIVER OF LIFE; or, Salvation Full and Free, 16mo, 1s.
- STRONG AND FREE. A Book for Young Men. 16mo, 1s.
- BRIGHT AND FAIR. A Book for Young Ladies. 16mo, 1s.
- FOLLOW THE LEADER. Counsels on the Christian Life. 16mo, 1s. 6d.
- DAY BY DAY; or, Counsels to Christians on the Details of Every-day Life. Cheap Edition. 16mo, 1s. 6d.
- NOT YOUR OWN. Counsels to Young Christians. 16mo, 1s.
- LITTLE FOXES: And How to Catch Them. 16mo, 1s.
- MY SPECTACLES: And What I Saw with Them. 16mo, 1s.
- BENEATH THE CROSS. Counsels, Meditations, and Prayers for Communicants. 16mo, 1s.
- SAFE AND HAPPY. Words of Help and Encouragement to Young Women. With Prayers for Daily Use. 16mo, 1s.

By the Very Rev. DEAN FARRAR,

THE HERODS. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

TEMPERANCE REFORM. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

SIN AND ITS CONQUERORS. Small crown 8vo, 1s. 6d. cloth.

WOMAN'S WORK IN THE HOME: As Daughter, Wife, and Mother. Long fcap. 8vo, cloth, 1s. 6d. ; paper cover, 1s.

"Consists of three delightful sermonettes or essays in Dr. Farrar's happiest style. They are so eloquent; the allusions are so apt and picturesque; they are so full of humanity kept in its proper place by humour which hardly shows on the surface."—*Literary World*.

"The book is an excellent one."—*Glasgow Herald*.

THE YOUNG MAN MASTER OF HIMSELF. Long fcap. 8vo, 1s. 6d. cloth.

By Mrs. A. RUSSELL SIMPSON.

FRIENDS AND FRIENDSHIP. Demy 16mo, 1s.

BUILDING FOR GOD ; or, Houses not Made with Hands. With Illustrations. Square 16mo, 1s.

STEPS THROUGH THE STREAM ; or, Daily Readings for a Month. Square 16mo, 1s.

BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS. Square 16mo, 1s.

WELLS OF WATER. Chapters Descriptive and Practical of the Wells mentioned in Scripture. Square 16mo, 1s.

GATES AND DOORS. Square 16mo, 1s.

A PITCHER BROKEN AT THE FOUNTAIN. Royal 32mo, 3d.

NISBET'S MINIATURE CHRISTIAN CLASSICS.

Red Line Editions. Crown 16mo. Uniformly bound in cloth, 1s. each ; with gilt edges, 1s. 6d. ; paste grain, 2s. 6d. each.

1. **BOGATZKY'S GOLDEN TREASURY.**

2. **KEBLE'S CHRISTIAN YEAR.**

3. **THE IMITATION OF CHRIST (THOMAS A KEMPIS).**

4. **THE POEMS OF GEORGE HERBERT.**

5. **BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS.**

6. **THE DIVINE INDWELLING.** Selections from Writings of WILLIAM LAW. With Introduction by Rev. A. MURRAY.

Works Devotional and Practical

By the Rev. J. R. MACDUFF, D.D.

BRIGHTER THAN THE SUN. A Life of our Lord for the Young. With twelve Full-page Illustrations. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d. Cheaper Edition, paper cover, 1s. ; cloth, 2s.

THE BOW IN THE CLOUD ; or, Words of Comfort for Hours of Sorrow. Royal 32mo, 1s.

THE MORNING AND NIGHT WATCHES. In one Vol. 16mo, 1s. 6d. ; separately, 1s. each.

SUNSETS ON THE HEBREW MOUNTAINS. With Frontispiece. Post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

MEMORIES OF BETHANY. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

STRENGTH FOR THE DAY. A Daily Book in the Words of Scripture for Morning and Evening. With an Introduction. 16mo, 1s. 6d.

THE GATES OF PRAYER. A Book of Private Devotion for Morning and Evening. 16mo, 1s. 6d.

FOOTSTEPS OF ST. PAUL. Being a Life of the Apostle. Designed for Youth. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 5s.

By MATTHEW HENRY.

EXPOSITION OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.
With Practical Remarks and Observations—

In Nine Volumes. Imp. 8vo, £2, 2s.

In Six Volumes. Medium 8vo, £1, 11s. 6d.

Published by James Nisbet & Co., Limited.

By the Rev. E. W. MOORE, M.A.,

INCUMBENT OF EMMANUEL CHURCH, WIMBLEDON.

THE PROMISED REST. Here and Hereafter. Small crown 8vo, in cloth, 2s. 6d. ; in leather, 3s. 6d.

CHRIST IN POSSESSION ; or, The Yielded Life. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

THE CHRIST-CONTROLLED LIFE ; or, The Secret of Sanctity. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

"An admirable little book."—*Word and Work.*

"It is enough to say that the intensity and reality of conviction which have made Mr. Moore's spoken utterances so forceful and so fruitful are found here ; and better still, there is also the quickening touch of an anointed servant."—*Life of Faith.*

"Sensible, simple, and earnest."—*Christian Leader.*

THE SPIRIT'S SEAL. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

By the Rev. J. R. MILLER, D.D.,

Author of "Making the Most of Life," &c. &c.

GLIMPSES THROUGH LIFE'S WINDOW. Small crown 8vo, with Portrait. Gilt top, 2s. 6d.

GIRLS : FAULTS AND IDEALS. With Quotations from Girls Letters. Crown 8vo, 6d.

YOUNG MEN : FAULTS AND IDEALS. With Quotations from Young Men's Letters. Crown 8vo, 6d.

LIST OF BOOKS OF FAMILY PRAYERS.

By the Rev. F. B. MEYER, B.A.

PRAYERS FOR HEART AND HOME. Morning and Evening Devotions for One Month for Family and Private Use. Pott 4to, 2s. 6d.

By the Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF RIPON.

CHURCHMAN'S BOOK OF FAMILY PRAYERS. Printed in Red and Black. Cloth plain, pott 4to, 3s. 6d.

By the Rev. J. REID HOWATT.

THE CHILDREN'S PRAYER BOOK. Being Prayers for the Use of the Young for One Month. Extra pott 8vo, 1s.

By the Rev. GORDON CALTHROP, M.A.

FAMILY PRAYERS FOR FOUR WEEKS. Imperial 16mo, 2s. 6d.

By M. L. M. DAWSON.

FAMILY PRAYERS FOR A MONTH. Demy 8vo, 1s. 6d.

By the Rev. J. OSWALD DYKES, D.D.

DAILY PRAYERS FOR THE HOUSEHOLD FOR A MONTH. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

By the Rev. GEORGE EVERARD, M.A.

BEFORE HIS FOOTSTOOL. Family Prayers for one Month. With Prayers for Special Occasions, and Introduction. Ninth Thousand. Crown 8vo, 3s.

By the Rev. J. R. MACDUFF, D.D.

MORNING FAMILY PRAYERS. Small 4to, 6s. 6d.

FAMILY PRAYERS. Small crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

FAMILY PRAYERS FOR FOUR WEEKS. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

DAILY PRAYERS FOR BUSY HOMES. 16mo, 6d.

EIGHTEEN PRAYERS. 16mo, 6d.

LONDON: JAMES NISBET & CO., LIMITED,
21 BERNERS STREET, W.

LONDON BIBLE COLLEGE

